UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association — English Language Edition

Vol. XIII — WINTER, 1961 — No. 4

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

The Assembly of New Delhi in Retrospect
Taizé, a Center of Ecumenism

ROGER MATZERATH, S. A.

Report from New Delhi

I. ORTIZ DE URBINA, S. J.

Catholic Ecumenism

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

The Text of Pope John XXIII's Encyclical in Commemoration of St. Leo the Great, Dealing with the Unity of the Church — A Catholic Appreciation of the Pan-Orthodox conference at Rhodes — The Message of the W. C. C. Assembly at New Delhi

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — BOOK REVIEWS
INDEX FOR 1961

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF THE ATONEMENT, GRAYMOOR
GARRISON, NEW YORK

Imprimatur:

✠ Hector Cunial
Archiep. tit. Soteropolitan., Vicesgerens

Rome, January 26, 1962.

ROME - PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE ASSEMBLY OF NEW DELHI IN RETROSPECT

The Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches came to an end on the fifth of December, following a visit by Pandit Nehru. Doubtless, it will go down in history for the important events to which it gave rise. On the one hand, the International Missionary Council, which issued forth from the missionary Edinburgh Conference of 1910 and which concerned itself solely with the Protestant missions, has now been integrated with the World Council of Churches and will henceforth simply constitute a department of that Council. And on the other hand, more than twenty new Churches have entered the ranks of the Council, and among them that of Moscow. (According to the policy of the Council, any autonomous Christian community is considered to be a Church, even if it were to possess but several thousand adherents). Moreover, a modification has been made of the profession of faith which is required for admission to the Council: heretofore, the formula called for the recognition of the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, while in the new doctrinal basis the Holy Trinity is explicitly named.

The work of the Assembly unfolded itself under the inspiration of the general theme, *Christ the Light of the World,* but in a particular way concentrated itself on three secondary themes: witness, service, and unity. We shall briefly set forth here some of the ideas elicited at the Assembly with respect to these important subjects.

Apropos of witness, there was above all an insistence on missionary activity. The Church, it was said, should make the effort to bring to all the appeal of the Gospel and of conversion. The fact of the creation within the Council itself of the Division of Missions and of Evangelism is a sufficient indication of the mind of the Assembly. It is a fact that for a long time the Protestants were not concerned with the missions. It was only towards the end of the eighteenth century that William Carey stirred up missionary zeal among his coreligionists. In like manner, the new director of the Division of World Mission and Evangelism, Dr. Lesslie Newbigin, has insisted that the missionary effort be continued. Among all the things, he said that are urged to be changed, this certainly

should not be among them; for if one were to think for an instant of those multitudes who are too far away to hear of the Gospel, one would understand how absurd it would be to imagine that the vocation to go among them is less urgent now than when St. Paul wrote: « How beautiful are the feet of those who preach the gospel of peace; of those who bring glad tidings of good things! » (Rom. 10, 15).

Certainly, Dr. Newbigin's point is well made. We must, however, make one serious reservation here. As long as separations subsist, the missionary activity of differing communities will only extend that division. To be sure, within the World Council they will insist that missionaries act in common as much as possible. But the Gospel requires more. It asks for unity, by means of which the world will believe: « That they all may be one so that the world will believe that Thou hast sent me » (John, 17, 21).

With regard to service, the Assembly heard the excellent recommendations made by the Japanese professor, Masao Takenaka. The Christian is to aid his brethren because he must love them. Thus, service will be disinterested and will not make a distinction of persons. If a man is in need, that fact alone is sufficient justification for helping him, whatever be his color, his race, or his opinion. Service should be intelligent: one ought not simply to assuage misery, but attack its causes. Above all, service should be Christian, rendered for Christ and with love and joy. Dr. Masao Takenaka goes on to tell this following personal experience: At one particular period when he was engaged as a minister-worker, he spent a good deal of time among the laborers, and for four months operated an electric crane. When he was about to leave the group, one of the workers asked him: « Masao, why is it that you never became angry? We have always seen you smiling ». And the reason given by this Japanese Christian was that he always tried to conserve the charity of Christ in his heart.

Most remarkable, too, is the reflection which Mr. Takenaka makes towards the end of his relation: « There is one question », he says, « which is truly urgent and insistent that poses itself with regard to the subject of Church unity. This is so especially in Asia where the Churches are generally tiny groups in the midst of vast non-Christian populations. The world is very severe in its judgement on the disunion of the Churches, not only in the matter of their service but also in that of their church life itself. How can divided Churches speak in a convincing manner of the unity of the world? How can we already arrest our quest for the unity of the people of God at the level of common service instead of carrying on further ahead our conversation and unity in Jesus Christ? »

Nothing could have served better to introduce the subsequent discussion on unity.

In effect, not only did the delegates at New Delhi hear a report on the theme of unity, but a step was taken that constitutes a definite progress: an agreement was reached on a rather precise definition of unity. The W. C. C. has long maintained that it had no proper conception of Christian unity and leaves to the Churches their own particular points of view. Now it has proposed the following description: « We believe that the unity which is both God's will and His gift to His Church is being made visible as all in each place who are baptised into Jesus Christ and confess Him as Lord and Saviour are brought by the Holy Spirit into one full-committed fellowship, holding the one apostolic faith, preaching the one Gospel, breaking the one bread, joining in common prayer, and having a corporate life reaching out to witness and service to all who at the same time are united with the whole Christian fellowship in all places and all ages in such wise that ministry and members are accepted by all, and that all can act and speak together as occasion requires for the tasks to which God calls His people. It is for such unity that we believe we must pray and work ».

This concrete definition, made up by an enumeration of the constituents of unity is still incomplete; there is lacking in particular the bond of the hierarchy, but it contains many of the essential elements which are in fact to be found in the Church of Rome.

The delegates at New Delhi were conscious of being still far from such unity. The General Secretary, Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, had declared in his report: « We cannot say that the fraternity which we have today in the World Council expresses that full harmony which St. Paul has in spirit. The expression which he uses in several instances *to auto phronein* « to possess the same sentiments » designates an incomparable unity more profound and more substantial than that to which we can pretend to at the present time. And even though it is given to us at times by the grace of God to render common witness, we cannot pretend that in the important domains of faith, of life, of the constitution of the Church, we are speaking with a single voice ». And later on in his report Dr. Visser 't Hooft added that there remains at present an immense amount of work to be accomplished by all the members of the Council together, and that is to prepare the Churches spiritually towards an action in view of unity.

The definition of unity proposed by the World Council remains, therefore, an ideal that is still distant. Without being perfect or complete, it is too inclusive to be capable of realization

without the help of an authority; and since it is a question of religion and truth, that authority should be infallible; and it should be visible so that it might be in conformity with our earthly condition and be easily recognized. In short, the conditions of unity call for the hierarchical system of the Catholic Church. Our separated brethren do not yet see this; but by means of the constitution of the Council, by a better knowledge of unity, and above all, perhaps, by the growing desire for that unity, they are on the way to meet us. On our part, by the will of the Vicar of Christ, we are heading towards a council one of whose aims is to make known and loved everywhere the unity for which our Lord addressed such an ardent prayer to his heavenly Father. Certainly, one has every right to hope for this.

THE EDITOR

TAIZÉ, A CENTER OF ECUMENISM

During recent months, the press in Europe has taken great interest in the religious community of Taizé, France. Daily and weekly papers have been full of reports, photographs, commentaries. This is because last September at Taizé, as announced in a brief communiqué, a conference was held between sixty Protestant clergymen and eight Catholic bishops. This extraordinary event aroused a good deal of attention: Taizé was visited, and the originality of this community of Protestant religious did the rest.

The Brothers of Taizé have long been known to the readers of *Unitas*. They have read the pages signed by their Prior, Brother Roger Schutz; they have been able to follow their publications. We think, therefore, that it would be pleasing to them if we were to search out the secret of their interior life and of their activity.

Let us briefly recall the external facts. At Taizé, a small Burgundian village, in a large manor house, lives a religious community all of whose members are Protestant. They are young men from various nations and even various confessions. They have made to God promises equivalent to religious vows: poverty, chastity, and obedience. Morning and evening, in a garb similar to that of the Trappists, they assemble in church for a liturgical function. Their numbers have increased to forty-five, and each one works according to his trade or profession. They welcome retreatants and close by, at Cormatin, have established a center of religious information. They also go on missions.

How did all this come about? The Brother Prior and founder was very kind in communicating to us the following account where he tells of the two events which prepared him for the calling which took him to Taizé:

« 1) In my childhood in the town in which I was studying far away from home, a Catholic woman, mother of many children and destitute after the loss of her husband, wished to take in boarders; and my parents, hearing of this, with great generosity, did not hesitate to place me in this Catholic family where for many years I was able to live in the atmosphere of a true and living Catholic faith. There was no money in the house; all trusted in Providence and lived very especially the communion of Saints. It must be

added that this family practised its faith in anything but a stereotyped fashion, and I was constantly aware of the manner in which the Catholic faith was thus practised. For my part, I had no faith and could thus study with a certain aloofness this Catholic family as well as my own family, also very devout and profoundly generous. On neither side were there exterior manifestations of anti-Catholic or anti-Protestant positions, and yet I was disturbed by the deep reciprocal lack of insight and constantly reflected on the absurdity on both sides in living for the love of God and one's neighbour and yet remaining separated.

Having become a believer, I promised myself to give up all that had kept me apart from the Christian life and to realize in this way, through my own life, a vocation for unity.

« 2) In my family I was the youngest after seven sisters. For their daughters my parents provided reading and read out loud themselves for several hours every day. I was frequently present at these readings, among others at those of Port-Royal-des-Champs by Sainte-Beuve. My family had a partiality for Port-Royal. At that time, not having the faith, I reasoned thus: monastic life, fervent and renewed — as it was during a certain period at Port-Royal owing to a return to its Cistercian monastic source — monastic life is a fermenting-agent of incalculable strength in the carrying out of an important activity in the life of the Church. While all at Port-Royal was of interest to me, it was the monastic element which I remembered most, its inherent strength and, on finding the faith, I began to study religious constitutions, including those of St. Ignatius. I followed retreats in monasteries, striving to understand all the force contained in this Christian mode of expression ».

Hence, the idea of working for the union of Christians comes from seeing two families both loving and serving Christ and yet remaining divided, one being Protestant and the other Catholic; and the plan of working in community springs from the example of Port-Royal. The day came, in 1939, when having refound his faith — faith in Christ according to his family's traditions.— Roger Schutz, still a student of theology at Lausanne, began to convert his dream into reality.

Just as Ignatius of Loyola, student at Sainte-Barbe, had gained his first companions to his ideal, so Roger Schutz groups a few friends about him. Together they have study sessions, spiritual retreats, and organize themselves into a sort of third-order which they call « the Big Community ». Then comes the second World War. The offer is made of a house at Taizé. Young Schutz, whose mother is French, goes there alone, resolved to help the French in their trouble. He does so for two years, at the same time maturing

his plans and already living his future rule. Obliged to return to Switzerland, he again frequents the « Big Community ». It is at this moment that, at Geneva, Max Thurian, the future theologian of Taizé, presents himself: he had read Pastor Schutz's appeal in favour of life in common: he himself was already in touch with a community of women who organized spiritual retreats at Grandchamp. Together with two companions he proclaims his readiness to live in community under the direction of Roger Schutz. A start was made at Geneva, and at the end of the war they came to Taizé. The ideal was a community of life consecrated to Jesus-Christ, in the Church and in the world. Several other young men answered the call, and on Easter Sunday 1949 the first seven Brothers made their profession.

The members of the Taizé group are Protestants. It is evident, however, that the French Protestant press (*Réforme, Le Christianisme au XX^e siècle*) is not much in their favour. M. Finet, editor of *Réforme,* once asked to which Church they belonged. But they are accepted by the leaders of French Protestantism; and recently Dr. Marc Boegner, whose authority is beyond question, took their part at the Assembly of French Protestants at Montbeliard last October. On the subject of the Community of Taizé, he said, among other things: « We are heartily grateful for the liturgical renewal towards which it is leading some of our Churches, for the atmosphere of adoration, the transparency of love which it has known how to establish and continually develops about itself. We like it because it has its eyes fixed on the splendid vision of the Body of Christ re-established in its visible unity ». Dr. Max Thurian, moreover, was called to Geneva, to the World Council of Churches' headquarters. The Brothers, who are ministers, were ordained according to the Reformed rite. While not adhering in full to the doctrines of Calvin and of Luther, they remain faithful to the Reformation on basic points.

There is however a lot that is new. The Community composed of Calvinists and Lutherans from various countries cannot be so very closely linked to French Protestantism. The Taizé brethren have their own way of living, their own liturgy, their own ideas.

Their interior life is enlightened and maintained by a Rule. The Prior speaks of its merit thus: « Deeply thought out, elaborated without haste, the fruit of long maturation, established mostly after a struggle, the Rule, once discovered must be obeyed. What strength, then, for the interior life! Eliminating all option, it enables one to build with resolution, putting unity into one's inner life because it leads in a determined and continuous direction all one's life long ». (R. Schutz, *Vivre l'aujord'hui de Dieu,* pp. 42-43)

The keeping of the three vows regulates the Brethren's fervour. They practise contemplation and inner silence. « In all that you do maintain inner silence in order to remain in Christ », says the Rule. They draw strenght from personal meditation. Office in common must be an ardent intercession for mankind and for the Church. If during office they don a white alb, it is because « The office tunic is to remind us that our entire being has been invested by Christ ».

The liturgy is simple: psalms, hymns, orations taken from the various Christian liturgies, prayers for specified persons, sometimes for the Holy Father, for the local bishop, for the parish priest, for friends at Taizé. The Lord's Supper frequently celebrated and, at certain times, even every day, is enacted according to the Protestant liturgy with a series of prefaces peculiar to Taizé. There is a preface of the Virgin, of Unity. There is private confession, and certain ascetical customs are favoured. In short, it consists in a life of union with Christ through prayer, work, and love of one another. Much has been taken from the various traditions of Catholic religious Orders and congregations. Perhaps more would be taken were they known from the inside.

It is the desire to serve Christ by serving the Church that inspires this form of life and this liturgy. The service that it is intended to render to the Church is the promotion of the union of Christians. Already in 1948 Max Thurian wrote: « Foremost in the Community's preoccupations comes the unity of Christians ». (*Verbum Caro,* Sept. 1948, p. 120.) The ecumenical position of Taizé has been clearly defined. (See R. Schutz, *Vivre l'aujourd'hui de Dieu,* pp. 65 ff; *Unitas,* 1955, pp. 94-99; Max Thurian in *Catholicité, July* 1947, pp. 17-27; *l'Unité visible des chrétiens et la Tradition,* 1961). According to Prior Schutz, Christian unity must absolutely be reached. « Tomorrow's generations will tolerate less and less the contradiction of the division of Christians into various confessions ». (*Vivre l'aujoud'hui ...,* p. 65.) And unity must be visible: « Only our visible unity is capable of proving to the world that we are sons of the same Father, faithful to the same Christ ». (ibid., p. 70.) A federated unity will not suffice: it « has no analogy with the profound unity of the Mystical Body of Christ ». (ibid., p. 73.) Unity must not be put off until the end of all time: « Ecumenism is a movement brought about by the Holy Spirit in order to visibly reunite all Christians in this world ». (p. 74.) Future unity will come to pass in truth, « where what already exists invisibly, our spiritual communion in the Mystical Body of Christ, will be realised visibly and completely in the communion of the same sacrament, at the same table, in the confession of the same faith, in the unity of the same discipline ». (Max Thurian, in *Ver-*

bum Caro, Sept. 1948, p. 121.) The means are dialogue, purity of intention and perseverance in an atmosphere of prayer.

But how will unity be reached? How, for example, will Protestants come to possess the same faith as Catholics? For that is the meaning of unity in one same faith. At Taizé they say that one must not speak of a return: this word signifies turning back again, and for this there is no enthusiasm. It will be a going beyond. (See M. Thurian, in *Catholicité,* 1947, p. 22; R. Schutz, *Documentation catholique,* 5, Mars 1961, p. 322.) Protestants will examine thoroughly their own principles and their profession of faith; Catholics will do likewise within their own confession. And the miracle will take place: « Unity will be given by God as a miracle. In fact, when all peripherical difficulties are removed, when the spirit of charity enables reciprocal comprehension and and penetration, one perceives at the core of our traditions, trends which for us are irreducible. Only supernatural intervention of the Holy Ghost can bring about ultimate unity. This will probably come to pass in a kind of excelling. One must not speak of denial, abjuration, renouncement for any of the Christian groups. Everyone must be invited to self-sacrifice, to the offering of his entire being to God so that he may be transformed by Him for the unity of his Church. Sacrifice, humiliation, purification thus become an overcoming of self. «Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God so that He may exalt you in due time » says St. Peter (I Pet. 5, 6) — sacrifice on the altar of unity, of our vocabulary, our psychology, our history, our ways of thinking and of feeling, the very expression of our dogmas, our organisations and our liturgies. Humiliation for all shortcomings in this offering and purification of all that God shows us as needing purification. The rest belongs to Him: the fire of His Spirit of love descending on our sacrifice in order to consume it and lift it up to Him ». (Max Thurian, in *Catholicité,* July 1947, pp. 22-23.)

No one will be surprised if a Catholic here points out the weak spot. He can admit only that which is positive in Protestantism: attachment to the Holy Scriptures, love of Christ, exaltation of grace; all that has merely to progress or even simply to be maintained, for it is already Catholic. But there are the denials of tradition, of the veneration of the Blessed Virgin and of the Saints, of most of the Sacraments, of the necessity of the apostolic succession for the validity of ordinations, of the infallibility of the Church, of the supremacy of the Pope. If these negations and a few others are not retracted and denied, there will be no agreement with Catholics who can never by any legitimate evolution be brought to admit them. No doubt at Taizé these negations are not insisted upon, and some of

them have even been withdrawn. If that is what is meant by surpassing, then we can come to terms; but it is at the same time a substantial change which could be called by another name. And in fact in the text that we have just read, is there not talk of sacrifice?

By whatever name it be called, it is true that the Taizé community's ideas differ on several points from those of an average Protestant. Max Thurian's books on celibacy for life, confession, confirmation, the Eucharist, would need but few alterations — one or the other, however, essential — in order to become Catholic. In this review we have spoken of each of his works, and we have underlined their many agreements with the Catholic way of thinking. But we have just received Max Thurian's latest book which contains a sketch of a general programme for ecumenical progress. We make a point of examining it here. We will benefit from it by getting a better knowledge of the ideas of Taizé and by penetrating further into the spirit of a community so devoted to the cause of Christian unity.

In this book entitled *The Visible Unity of Christians and Tradition* (Delachaux & Niestlé, Taizé Press, pp. 120), Max Thurian publishes three articles which he originally drafted in connection with the research of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches. It deals first with the visible unity of the Church, then with Tradition, and finally with the prayer for unity.

There are two ways in which a Catholic reader can view this book written by a Protestant: either he judges it from the point of view of Catholic orthodoxy and must admit that it is far removed, or he compares it with the doctrine of an average Protestant and recognises that it is the result of a considerable effort to come closer to the Catholic position. We would like at this juncture to point out the nature and the interest of this effort.

M. Thurian is striving to promote this unity of all Christian people. This will come to pass, he says, when « the Church can be recognised as the unique community uniting all Christians in one same faith and communion ». All Christians must, therefore, be brought to confess one same faith. At first sight it seems easy that all should accept the first four Councils: those of Nicea and Constantinople on the Trinity, those of Ephesus and of Chalcedon on the Incarnation. These Councils are in fact the interpretation of the Scriptures given by an undivided Christendom. These councils are really ecumenical, and could not be called in question other than by an unlikely hypothesis, but for which a Protestant must make due reserve, of a prophet appearing just for that purpose. In fact the Protestants of the 16th and 17th centuries acknowledged them, and it was only in the 18th cent. that certain of them were

repudiated. Their ecumenical value should, however, make them acceptable to all. This first step accomplished, a second seems easy. The Church remained undivided until the seventh Council. Everything invites the recognition of the first seven Councils, either because of their ecumenicity or because of their conformity with the Scriptures and with the preceding Councils. The doctrine of the seventh Council which approves the cult of images, is itself merely a consequence of the Incarnation: the invisible became visible in order to adapt itself to the needs of our nature.

If now all Christians meditate upon the Scriptures in the light of the first seven Councils, everything seems to bring one to believe that doctrinal agreement will be further extended: in this way an advance will be made towards unity in the same faith. But unity of ministry must also be reached. On this point M. Thurian notes that the fundamental differences of opinion between the Churches come from the acceptance or refusal of the episcopal ministry. Now it seems possible that all could acknowledge the function of Bishops. According to the New Testament, the apostles who were like itinerant Bishops, took the trouble to find successors or at least instruments by which they themselves could exercise their powers until the end of time. No doubt the original episcopal function should not be complicated with later additions; but it did constitute an authority which maintained unity in one Church and which was transmitted by the laying on of hands.

How would the multiplicity of bishops maintain unity in the Church, M. Thurian asks? He answers it first by an appeal to an ecumenical, truly ecumenical, council whose decisions would be applicable to all and then, between one council and another by the permanent sitting of a central organism whose duty would be to see that the council decrees were carried out.

An essential sign of unity is that all partake of the same bread, participate at the same Eucharistic banquet. Here again, all seems possible. M. Thurian thinks that even now Calvinists and Lutherans have the same eucharistic faith, — which implies an important change since the time of Luther and Calvin; and as M. Thurian, who belongs to the Calvinist tradition, in a recent book upheld on this point opinions fairly close to the Catholic faith, one can understand the reasons for his hopes.

With all these proposed changes, one certainly reaches a stage less remote from Catholicism than classic Protestantism, and in this way a further step towards unity is taken. M. Thurian's trend of thought is perhaps even more worthy of attention than his explicit assertions. When the unity of all Christians in one same faith is truly sought, one is led to the idea of taking up again

the agreements sanctioned by the Councils; we then come to the differences which came about at a moment in history and wonders whether they are founded on reason: if, for example, the suppression of the episcopate was called for by Holy Scripture. Finally, one perceives that the conditions of unity require an instrument of unity, the Council, and the Council not being permanent, the necessity of a central authority, a Bishop-primate ... One can see where this movement would lead were it to reach its logical conclusion.

It remains, however, a good way off. But M. Thurian can, in any case, continue to reflect. He may come to see better the reasonable conditions of an ecumenical Council. To demand that all who bear the name of Christian should be represented there is to declare such a Council impossible. The Council of Nicea was contested by the Arians, that of Ephesus by the Nestorians, that of Chalcedonia by the Monophysites, just as that of Trent was by the Protestants and the First Vatican Council by the « Old Catholics ». Afterwards to admit the possibility, even a remote one, that a truly ecumenical Council be legitimately confuted by a prophet, would open the door to incertitude. It is of no use to appeal to Holy Scripture if no official body guarantees its right interpretation. Finally, if this assurance is to be based on the truth which Christ cannot have failed to give to His Church, it is necessary that the Council itself be convoked, its discussions judged, its authenticity verified, its action continued after its adjournment, its future authority maintained; in short, the Bishop primate is necessary, and he must possess the prerogatives of the rock on which Jesus built His Church. The definition of the infallibility of the Bishop of Rome, pronounced by the First Vatican Council, has not, therefore, to be altered. The rock must remain as such.

M. Thurian sets great hope « in the person of John XXIII who, through his episcopal ministry, is trying to understand the needs of the Church and of the world and desires to be the model-Bishop in the model-Church ». It is due to a providential grace that the presence of the reigning Pope should remind one of the dignity of Peter from whom he is descended, and that he should give cause to make it esteemed. It is a dignity which is a service and a service that is irreplaceable.

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

REPORT FROM NEW DELHI

Certainly, in more than one respect, the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches held at New Delhi, India, from November 18th to December 5th was an impressive affair. The world meeting of Protestants and Orthodox brought together, from more than 50 countries, 577 delegates, 105 advisers, 45 observers, 100 youth participants, 59 fraternal delegates, and 120 guests.

Immediately after the Assembly had opened in prayer and had settled down to its first session, the World Council of Churches brought into its fold the International Missionary Council. Although this action had been prepared for long in advance and was anticipated with great expectation as the merger of the third basic element of the ecumenical movement — the World Council came alive in 1948 in the union of the Faith and Order and Life and Work movements — the integration seemed to be rather uneventful when it finally happened. Perhaps the union lost some of its excitement because it was a foregone conclusion that needed only the official action of the Assembly. Or else it may have been the personal impression of this observer who missed the full panoply of Roman ceremony. In any case, after a quiet but fervent Protestant order of worship, the I.M.C. proceeded to change its initials to C.W.M.E. and took its seat in the Council as the Commission on World Mission and Evangelism.

Of greater interest, seemingly, was the affiliation to the W.C.C. of the big 50 million member Russian Orthodox Church. Heading the Russian delegation was Archbishop Nikodim of Jaroslav and Rostov, chief of the Foreign Church Relations Department of the Moscow Patriarchate.

At a crowded press conference, Archbishop Nikodim affirmed among other things that the Russian Orthodox Church was completely free from State interference in the Soviet Union; but many took this to mean that the church had to manage to survive there and that it would not serve to stir up unnecessary trouble.

Not as spectacular, but equally important, was the admission into the World Council of 22 other churches besides the Russian Church, 11 of which came from Africa. The Council underlined this emphasis on the so-called younger churches from the newer

countries of Africa again and again as part of its expansion program to be a world body in fact as well as in name. No less, apparently, the move was a part of the universal recognition that Africa has come of age and may well make a vigorous new contribution in the coming decades to the older churches. How strongly the Assembly felt in this matter may be seen in its action of admitting the Presbyterian Church of Nigeria into its ranks and then immediately elevating its delegate, Sir Francis Ibiam, a layman, to the position of one of its six presidents.

With the additions having been approved after due procedure, the Assembly set to work in earnest. And if it said work, it meant it. The delegates gave themselves over to 17 days of intensive activity — a combination of continuous study, talking, and attending sessions. Fortunately, the weather of New Delhi was delightful, a beautiful Fall climate; the hall, built for UNESCO, was comfortable, ample, and eminently serviceable; and everyone felt the spirit of fellowship.

If high-minded devotion was needed for the cause, dogged determination was necessary to fulfill the program outlined, and despite a few absentations now and then to go to Agra where the Taj Mahal is situated, the participants had both. Under the theme, « Jesus Christ the Light of the World », the program was divided into various parts. Plenary sessions heard papers on the three general areas of the Assembly's study: Witness, Service, and Unity. Other general sessions dealt with the Laity, International Affairs, Faith and Order, Social Change, Speaking to the World, and the Bible. Each day began with morning worship or Bible study, and each evening closed with night prayers. After the integration of the International Missionary Council and the seating of delegates from the churches newly accepted into the World Council was accomplished, the Council broke up into the three sections of witness, service, and unity and 17 committees which were organized along the main lines of the Council's daily work. Study and discussion in the sections proceeded on the basis of annotated agendas which had been in preparation for two years. The committees met eight times for a total of 20 hours study on specialized subjects such as: Church and Society, Evangelism, Missionary Studies, Youth, Interchurch Aid and Service to Refugees, World Mission and Evangelism, Finance, and Information. Within what seemed too short a time to many delegates, reports were made up from the three sections and 17 committees and presented to the general assembly for discussion and approval in 11 deliberative or business sessions. The delegates also elected a new board of six Presidents, two of whom were laymen, a central committee of 100, and

a Faith and Order Commission of 120; voted a new, enlarged budget; and changed the Basis, or foundation, of collaboration for the member churches. A worshipful « Amen » closed the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches.

* * *

Any serious meeting is bound to produce important results. When the meeting is held under the imminence of a nuclear umbrella, with an urgency born of the conviction that Christ's will is for unity, and within what Dr. Visser 't Hooft, general secretary of the World Council, called « ecumenical mobilization », it cannot help but bring forth abundant fruits, sweet or otherwise, according to individual taste.

From an outside point of view, such as that of the several Catholic journalists present at the Assembly, many of the fruits evoked genuine praise and admiration. The sincerity and earnestness of the delegates was unmistakable. Real concern for the purity of doctrinal matters, contrary perhaps to a general Catholic conception of the Protestant position, was evident; at times it showed itself as a kind of anguish over the divisions in Christendom and the necessity for church unity according to the will of God. The impression grew strong that Catholics might well learn from the zeal and devotion of these World Council delegates in their dedication to prayer and work for unity.

At the same time the technique of accomodating individual views was disappointing. Constant solicitude to make everyone content by including the special viewpoints of member churches and by eliminating objectionable material was bound to weaken any doctrinal position. Perhaps this was inevitable since the World Council of Churches is simply an organization working as an agent for its member churches and, in order to avoid the frequently asserted charge of being a super-church, must bend backwards to take into account what each member says. The results in doctrinal matters, however, show up in general formulas which lend weight to a feeling of relativity. As the report on the Section on Unity frankly admits, after giving a lengthy description of the unity of the church, « We are not yet of a common mind on the interpretation and the means of achieving the goal we have described ». At the present rate of progress some of the delegates themselves felt that the visible unity of the church will take centuries; others quite rightly see that it can come about only through a miracle of God's grace.

The weakness of the conciliar approach was concretely illus-

trated in the crucial matter of intercommunion, or open communion for all. On Sunday, November 26th, the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon (Anglican) held a communion service open to all present who were baptized communicant members of their own churches. However, it was stressed that this was only a temporay arrangement allowed for occasions such as the meeting of the World Council. The report on Unity, moreover, spoke about the failure to share in the one Table of the Lord as an obvious contradiction, admitted candidly that nowhere are the divisions of the churches more clearly evident than at the Lord's Table, and affirmed its « impasse » on intercommunion. The assembly could do little else than urge the member churches to earnestly consider the question and referred it to a future meeting of Faith and Order where it will appear on the agenda for study and discussion.

On other counts, however, all Catholics may sincerely admire their brethren. I sat next to a Jesuit professor of Scripture, temporarily turned journalist, at a session of Bible study. He genuinely marvelled at the technique used to inculcate a love and knowledge of the Word of God. After reading an appropriate text, the leader made a commentary on its meaning and then asked several questions to help in a meditation of the passage. When everyone had meditated on the points, the leader asked the audience to share the fruits of their meditation. Each one who spoke managed to cover a different idea which the text suggested. At the end, the leader gave a final summary. How wonderful it would be, the professor remarked, if we could do this with our Catholic people.

The World Council treatment on the place and importance of the laity also had much to commend itself. Dr. Paul D. Devanandan, director of the Christian Institute for the Study of Religion and Society in Bangalore, India, declared in a major address that, « The Church can penetrate the vastness of its secular environment and fulfill its mission only when it sets forth in its local expression the visible marks of genuine and dynamic community ». Translating this viewpoint into other terms, he went on to say that it means the layman is needed to make the Gospel intelligible to men in the world of work, in family life, in leisure time, in the work-a-day world. « There is still so much of the professional in the Church's ministry », he complained, « which alienates the common folk in the farm, the factory, and the market place ».

The insistence on the need for the laity was heard again and again throughout the Assembly. Three addresses were given on the subject, a committee on the Department of the Laity presented a full report, and although the clergy constituted 62 % of the As-

sembly delegates, two laymen were elected to the six member Presidium of Presidents, a Nigerian Presbyterian, Sir Francis Ibiam, and a Wall Street Methodist, Mr. Charles Parlin. As one participant put it, formerly we thought of the laity as a help to the pastor; today we look upon the pastor as a help to the laity. The statement reflected both the consensus of opinion that the church must fulfill its task through the laymen and that the laymen, to be more efficient, need the help of theologians and of active participation in worship.

Another subject which the delegates paid special attention to was the place of the church in a rapidly changing society. Professor Egbert de Vries, rector of the International Institute of Social Studies in the Netherlands, delivered a penetrating analysis of the church's position. « Any church », he declared, « which is static or too introspective, is committing suicide in a dynamic self-directed society ». The church must take the world, that is the society in which it lives, seriously, and this means seriously participating in its concerns. The church cannot stand aloof from the changes in politics, culture, education, and technology which are changing daily-life around the globe.

No one can keep the present state of things out of the church. Closing the door or window will not do it. Closing one's mind leads to insanity. The church, moreover, cannot retreat into a specious spiritualism or escape by condemning militarism, racism, or ten other evil « isms » from afar. Christians must simply get out into the market place and perform their Christian task as the salt of the earth. The Assembly listened attentively and accepted the good sense this advice made.

The delegates had a lot of things of their own to say.

— Many supported a view that the work of the Section on Unity was a « theological torso », that is, the concern of the church for herself, and not the concern of the church for Christ, the Head of the church.

— One participant from Uganda boldly declared that unity of the church had not been defined because of the fear of the delegates to go against the mandate of their churches. What they were doing was to tackle common problems, he said, and until unity was defined all efforts would be worth nothing.

— An Orthodox delegate affirmed that there would be no end to theological speculation; the Assembly should therefore approach the problem of unity in terms of love.

— One misunderstanding occurred that seemed disastrous for a time. A delegate from Austria, speaking in German, declared that the Catholic Church considered all non-Catholic marriages

invalid and the parties to be living in concubinage. A check revealed that the translator had misunderstood and had given out a mistaken version to the predominantly English speaking audience. What the delegate spoke about were unauthorized mixed marriages involving Catholics.

— A demand was made at various times that the ecumenical task be brought down to the level of the ordinary parishoner. To help in such a laudable project the suggestion was repeated in different ways that the classical and high-sounding theological terminology be toned down to ears accustomed to more popular terms.

Toward the end of the meeting, the delegates approved a new form of the Basis. This is not the creed of the World Council nor a full statement of Christian faith. Its purpose is to say what holds the member churches together and what is the starting point of their collaboration with each other. It formerly read: « The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of churches which accept Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour ». After an interesting discussion in which Archbishop Nikodim lent gracious assistance to the expanded form, the Assembly adopted the following Basis: « The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfill together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit ».

The adoption of the new Basis was important from the Catholic point of view for two reasons. In the first place it showed the World Council is moving, that is, the common consensus of the member delegates is changing, away from an extreme Protestant position, slowly and awkwardly perhaps but definitely, and approaching a more Catholic position. In some Catholic ecumenical circles a step by step approach is held to be the only likely one, and each step is applauded even though in the total picture it forms only a minute particle.

Secondly, the change, partial and small though it be, points up what may become a fruitful contribution of the Orthodox. The Russians, according to Archbishop Nikodim, came to the World Council to take part especially in the deliberations of Faith and Order, that is, in doctrinal matters. The weight of the Russians together with that of the other Orthodox may tip the scales more and more in favor of Catholic positions.

Finally the Assembly adopted its message to the world. This was part of its normal procedure. Two things, however, changed the usual pattern. The Orthodox, who regularly have issued a message of their own in the past protesting against some of the doctrinal positions taken by the Assembly, decided on this occasion

not to put forth a separate statement. They felt that they could make their stand sufficiently clear by contributing to the work of the Assembly. The other slightly unusual action of the Assembly consisted in a special message sent to the Christians in South Africa. It was a warm, sympathetic, and fraternal letter pledging solidarity with all who serve and suffer to eliminate race or color discrimination and prayed that, « as the peoples of Africa move into their new day the church of Christ will play an ever-increasing creative role in promoting understanding, justice, faith, hope, and love ».

The message itself, as in the case of previous declarations, was something to be quoted, but it did not contain anything as important as had already been stated in the Assembly's discussions and considerations. Nevertheless, it neatly summed up the whole and reaffirmed the theme of the Assembly, « Jesus Christ the light of the world », recapitulating its work, and concluding that the real letter of the Assembly written to the world consists in Christian people who are a message from Christ to the world. « The message is that God in Christ has reconciled the world to Himself ». To all of which the delegates fervently declared, « Thanks be to God ».

Roger Matzerath, S. A.

CATHOLIC ECUMENISM

On the 29th October 1921 Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines, received an unexpected visit from the Anglican Lord Halifax and the Vincentian priest, Père Portal. The purpose of their coming was to request the Cardinal to organize conferences between Catholics and Anglicans with a view to a reunion of the two bodies. This request came about partly as a result of the Oxford Movement, and partly from an appeal for unity made in 1920 by 252 Anglican bishops in London at the sixth Lambeth Conference.

The Archbishop was unprepared for such a suggestion, and asked his visitors why they had not made it to the English bishops. Lord Halifax's reply was that the English bishops were in an unsympathetic frame of mind. So not wishing to close the door in the face of a sincere request from outside, Cardinal Mercier made the suggested invitation. Thus, in 1920 the Malines conversations began: they went on for four years until 1925, and were attended on the Anglican side by Lord Halifax, W. Frere, bishop of Truro, Bishop Gore, A. Robinson and Dr. Kidd; and on the Catholic side by Cardinal Mercier, his vicar-general Mgr Van Roey, Père Portal, Mgr Batiffol, and Fr Hemmer.

Pope Pius XI, though he gave them no official sanction, approved of the Malines conversations, at first privately, later on in a veiled reference in public in the consistorial allocution of 24th March 1924. « We are very grateful », said Pius XI, « to all those Catholics who strive to eradicate prejudice, teach all the Church's doctrine, and above all show in themselves the charity which is the distinctive mark of Christ's disciples. By these means they open the way to the true faith for those outside the Church who are moved by Divine Grace » [1]. A letter of the following day from Cardinal Gasparri to Cardinal Mercier made it clear that these words were a recognition of the value of the Malines conversations he had promoted [2].

The conversations were encouraged by the archbishops of Canterbury and York. Dr Davidson, The Anglican primate, in a

---

[1] *A. A.S.* 16, (1924) pp. 123-124.

[2] Cf. G. de Bivort de la Saudée, « Malines - Conversazioni » (*Enciclopedia Cattolica*, VII, 1918).

circular letter of 1923 said that the conversations were a part of the general drawing together of the Churches following the Lambeth appeal.

On the Catholic side the conversations were not always viewed favoroubly. Most of the English bishops, including Cardinal Bourne, considered them inopportune. Fr. Woodlock, S. J. re-echoed this opinion in the review *Etudes,* published in Paris on the 15th August, 1925, where he gave the text of a speech by Lord Halifax with some adverse criticism. He said that corporate reunion of the Anglican Communion and the Catholic Church was impossible, and that there was no parallel here between Anglicanism and the Eastern Orthodox Churches which still have valid ordination [3].

Lord Halifax had said that « reconciliation with Rome does not imply any abdication of the historic position of Canterbury, nor does it suppose the absorbing of the Church of England into the Church of Rome. Rather it means the union of the two churches under the primacy of the successor of St Peter — a totally different idea ». Fr Woodlock wrote that this was ambiguous and erroneous: Anglicans like Lord Halifax believed that they were already Catholics, and therefore reunion with Rome was for them desirable but not necessary. The Latin mentality of the Continent (Fr. Woodlock wrote) found it difficult to understand ' the illogical position ' of Anglicans. John Bull, no more than the rest of men, could lay no special claim to being a rational animal [4].

The subject-matter for the Malines conversations covered the various theological fields which formed the main obstacle to union between Catholics and Anglicans. In the final speech Cardinal Mercier read (without naming the author) a statement on the pallium which various Anglican metropolitans claimed they wore rightfuly. The statement was the work of Dom Lambert Beauduin, recently named first superior of the Benedictine abbey of Amay-sur-Meuse (now Chevetogne), and had for its title the phrase of Lord Halifax « The Anglican Church united, not absorbed ». This expression, open to equivocation as it was, and the general tone of the statement, appeared to many at the time to be dangerous and even revolutionary. It was owing to its cool reception and to the death of Cardinal Mercier in January 1926 that the conversations of Malines were finally brought to a close.

Before we go on to describe the actual development of Catholic ecumenical thought, it will be useful to make now the following observations on what we have been considering:

---

[3] Ibid. 184, 1925, p. 308.

[4] Ibid. p. 310.

1. The Malines Conversations were in modern times an absolutely new departure in the apostolate of union.

2. Their basic principle was the belief of both Catholics and Anglicans that *corporate* reunion of their churches was both possible and desirable.

3. Therefore an attempt was made at a theological level to remove prejudice and clear the way for corporate reunion.

4. The meeting between the two churches was the result of an appeal made at the Lambeth conference which had just taken place.

All these elements, as we shall see, appear in Catholic ecumenism as it is at present. If the Malines conversations cannot be designated as ecumenical — the word did not then have this meaning — they must be said to form the first chapter of the movement from the Catholic side.

Opinion was not at that time favourable. Most thought of the corporate reunion of those outside the Church as a Utopian dream. It was an unattainable ideal on which it was not well to rely. It was thought to be a waste of time, something that would set back the numbers of individual reunions — or conversions as they were then called. For example, Father R. Janin, writing in 1922 in the first edition of his fine book *Les Eglises orientales et les rites orientaux* sums up very wisely the hope for a return of those outside the Church and poses the question as to whether the reunion of the Eastern Orthodox Churches is possible. To this he replies: « At present we can definitely say that it is dangerously unrealistic to count on the return en masse of all the dissident churches of the East to Catholic unity » [5]. The reason is to be found in the differences which divide them. But can we not at least hope for the return of single Orthodox Churches of the East? Father Janin is of a negative opinion, for this would be impossible without the powerful intervention of the secular authority, and now there is no state powerful enough or religious enough to bring itself to do this. His conclusion is that one cannot, therefore, in the present state of affairs reasonably hope for the reunion of individual churches [6]. This point of view which deemed hopes of corporate reunions as being unrealistic was the most widespread among Catholics until the start of the second World War. They forgot the Malines conversations, or at least considered them an unsuccessful experiment, a closed chapter in the apostolate of Church Unity.

---

[5] Ibid. p. 698.

[6] Ibid. p. 699.

Waves of Russian refugees had poured into the West in 1921, and Orthodox students for the first time were studying at the Oriental Institute in Rome and at other Catholic Universities, but this did nothing to change the general mentality.

The idea behind the Malines conversations was not indeed completely forgotten, but was confined to a few pioneers. This idea was fostered and nourished in the priory at Amay. The priory, heir to Dom Beauduin's zeal, was the frequent resort of many Orthodox Russians, and has become to-day a leader of Catholic ecumenism [7]. Dom Beauduin visited many monasteries in his travels through France, and took the opportunity to spread his enthusiasm for inter-denominationol discussions to the Istina study-group in Paris, and also to Paul Couturier, the kindly abbé of Lyons who was to become one of the best-known promoters of Catholic ecumenism. Fr. Couturier at the age of 52 was a professor of physics and the natural sciences. It was at this time that he had occasion to meet with Russian refugees who benefited from his generous charity along with that of Père Albert Valentin S. J. His knowledge of this deeply religious people awoke in his heart a new vocation. Couturier was full of enthusiasm but unfortunately not well-grounded in theology. In time he retired to Amay to prepare for his new apostolate under the guidance of Dom Belpaire. Returning to Lyons in 1932, he devoted himself heart and soul to furthering, as he used to say « The unity of all Christians ». His efforts were courageous but prudent. In 1933 he organized a Unity triduum with the assistance of a Russian choir. In 1934 there followed a solemn Unity Week organised in his special way, and with prayers largely of his own composition. The result he looked for was a humble acknowledgment to the non-Catholic churches of our faults in their regard and the sending up to heaven of a great chorus of prayer coming at the same time from Catholic, Anglican, Orthodox, and Reformed Churches: to join with Christ in the prayer ' Ut unum sint '.

Couturier was convinced that the time was not yet that of the theologians and of hierarchical authority. We must first have « psychological good-will, the prayers, virtues and mutual appreciation of individuals and of all their human and Christian values ». Together with other collaborators, he organized a week of interchurch discussions, and prayers and studies for Christian unity, first in Lyons, then at Strasbourg, Marseilles, Toulouse, and Lille. Couturier's apostolate soon won support from organizations from

---

[7] Cf. O. Rosseau: « In memoriam, Don Lamberto Beauduin (1873-1960 ») *Irenikon* 33 (1960) 1-28.

other countries, like the German Una Sancta movement, and the Geneva Pro Deo movement. In 1934 on the advice of an Orthodox Russian he held his Unity Week for some Anglicans, at first in the 'papalist' abbey of Nashdom, then in many other ecclesiastical centres. He organised inter-church « cells », of which the first was at Erlenbach in Switzerland, and also gave spiritual retreats to non-Catholics, like the one held at Dombes in Switzerland for thirty Calvinist pastors and one Catholic priest. He was a firm friend of the Protestant community of Taizé and its female counterpart at Grandchamp. He even extended his work to the Scandinavian countries of Denmark, Norway and Sweden where he introduced his Unity Weeks.

In his bedroom three crosses were to be seen — the Greek and Latin crucifixes, and the plain Protestant cross. There, on the 24th March 1953, died the benevolent Paul Couturier. To his many admirers and imitators he left this brief will: « I entrust to you the Christian Unity Week. Do all you can: it is the basis of ecumenism ».

Since Couturier, Catholic ecumenists have become legion, and their numbers and vigour are still increasing. Ecumenists to-day are especially active and numerous in France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and Germany where they have been represented by public figures such as Fr. Metzger, Director of Una Sancta, who was murdered by the Hitler regime, and Jesuit writer Fr Pribilla.

In the last score of years the movement has been named « Catholic ecumenism », still rather a loose term. It seems to have been chosen by analogy with the term ecumenism by which are described the efforts towards unity of the World Council of Churches. This latter was formed in 1948, and resulted from the desire for unity in the many Protestant and Anglican bodies, and in some Orthodox churches. It was designed to give a larger scope to the old « Faith and Order » and « Life and Work » movements. The World Council of Churches attempts to unite in some way all the Christian communities. This is striven for on the basis of mutual beliefs and intercommunion, and the acceptance of the Bible and the Divinity of Christ the Saviour as fundamental. However, each church retains its own jurisdiction and reserves the right to define its own belief. Such notions as these are an insuperable obstacle to the Catholic Church. However much they may wish it, Catholics cannot join in the ecumenism of Geneva. So we can see that there is a fundamental difference between Catholic Ecumenism and that of the World Council of Churches. Nevertheless, I believe that the growth of the World Council will lead to an increase in Catholic ecumenical activity. This is because it aims, however inadequately,

at the corporate reunion of the Churches; and by seeking contacts with Catholics, it encourages the optimism of our ecumenists regarding corporate reunion. Also it has done much to aid mutual understanding and the exchange of views which the ecumenists are eager to promote. On this, then, Catholic ecumenists agree with those of Geneva: a reunion en masse is possible, and fraternal discussions are to be sought in order to prepare the way for it.

We have just given a brief account of the growth of Catholic ecumenists in our day. They are a rather well-defined group, with criteria and methods of their own. It is these that I should like to assess now, perhaps the first time that this task has been attempted. First of all, I cannot agree with those who say that Catholic ecumenism is the same as the apostolate of conversion, which has been going on as long as have the differences which it seeks to reconcile.

Those who work for individual conversions and of small groups do not always share the optimism and methods of the ecumenists. Rather ecumenism is one aspect of the conversion apostolate; and the difference, I believe, lies in the attitude towards the idea of corporate reunion of the separated churches. Those engaged in the apostolate of conversion reject corporate reunion as impossible, even over a protracted period of time, and place their reliance on attaining unity mainly through the convincing of individuals or the return of small groups. Catholic ecumenism says this method would take too long — in fact doubts that it would ever take place. Moreover, it affirms that even if it were attainable, it would be at the cost of the disintegration of the separated churches, and the loss to the Catholic Church of the collective virtues they still retain. Catholic ecumenism can thus be defined as the movement in the Catholic apostleship of unity which looks for the corporate reunion of the separated churches, and uses means directed to this end. The non-ecumenists on their side maintain that this ideal is unrealistic or at last fraught with too many problems. They rely more on individual conversions, for which they shape their apostolate. This, they say, is a surer and more practical method. These are two different means to the same end, two practical formulas, each based on its own separate assessment of the situation. Some means they have in common — prayer, the safeguarding of Eastern rites, mutual knowledge, and above all true and efficacious Christian charity. To these Catholic ecumenism adds its own methods: a series of conferences with non-Catholics, retreats even at the level of the episcopate, and studies on controverted points by theological professors. All this is directed to forming a new atmosphere of mutual personal knowledge, friendship and brotherhood

between the officials and ministers of the different Christian communities. This mutual friendship and respect seems to be the best way of dissolving centuries-old difficulties, breaking down old prejudices, and creating the necessary conditions for paving the way for real and perfect unity. True, the unity that non-Catholics are striving for is not that fusion desired by Christ and put forward by the Catholic Church. But we should not on this account despair — undoubtedly the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, is at work in the souls of many non-Catholics who have abandoned their old ideas and practices, and are now taking striking steps in the direction of the Catholic Church, — for instance the Taizé community. If they continue docile to the Holy Spirit, how can they fail eventually to discover the real centre of Christian unity? If such a move cannot come about without a miracle, that is only to say that it is impossible humany speaking. But as Oscar Cullmann has shown so well, this is true also for our individual salvation, for which we work in the hope of receiving the necessary divine grace. Ecumenists both inside and outside the Church are working on this principle.

There is one question of a delicate nature for Catholics which is resolved for the most part on general principles but which is viewed under various aspects. It is the problem of individual reunions. Naturally good Catholics welcome with joy any non-Catholic who spontaneously approaches the Church. But a positive apostolate promoting those conversions by private contact and public talks does not find real favour with ecumenists, for two reasons: it is considered too slow a process, and also because it would strain relations with non-Catholics who are very sensitive to what they feel is proselytism. Couturier frankly hoped that for the apostolate of unity proselytism would be placed out of bounds.

Now that we have had a definition of the nature and aims of Catholic ecumenism, I should like to render a judgment upon it. Since Catholic ecumenists do not always agree on all points, and because we are dealing basically with pastoral practice, which is always open to differing judgments in differing situations, we can therefore come to no hard and fast verdict. It is necessary for us to be cautious — ready to revise our judgment according to differing pastoral conditions, Ecumenism has its advantages but also its dangers. A road is not necessarily the wrong one, however, just because there happen to be dangers along the way. The chief advantage of ecumenism is its open and optimistic mentality which encourages frequent friendly contact with non-Catholics, and definitely improves their relations with the Catholic Church. A

splendid proof of this change was the unexpected visit of the Archbishop of Canterbury to Pope John XXIII — a gratifying outcome of Catholic ecumenism. Likewise, we must not underestimate the positive value of the periodic exchange of views with non-Catholic theologians, such as the annual meetings at Chevetogne, Paris, Paderborn, and Niederaltaich, all of which had an inspiring precedent in the Congresses of Velehrad. These meetings remove mutual misunderstandings, and also correct certain inexactitudes which sometimes appear in our theology manuals, which quite often do not give the actual Protestant doctrines, and sometimes even attribute unauthentic pronouncements to Luther. On their side the Protestants, perhaps for the first time, see the full sweep of Catholic theology which their books frequently misrepresent. It is in this atmosphere of charity that terms are defined and points of agreement and disagreement are discovered. Sometimes it may be revealed in peaceful discussion that identical words and phrases hide a deep difference of concept, and on the other hand fundamental agreement may be revealed on points which have been phrased entirely differently. It goes without saying that these talks put the controversial figures of history in their proper setting. For example, Luther in his first years of violent polemical writing was neither as bad as Catholics have claimed nor as good as the non-Catholics have said he was.

It should be remembered that we are indebted principally, if not exclusively, to Catholic ecumenism for the change in vocabulary in our talks with non-Catholics. Words have dropped out of use which were unnecessary and hurt the feelings of either party. The effort is made not to speak any more of heretics and schismatics or of conversions, but of our separated brethren and of reunion. Ecumenists reason that we should distinguish in our language the Catholics who originally broke away from the Church from their descendants who have grown up and lived in good faith for many generations. Thus, for example, they feel that the word « conversion » is unsuitable for those who have been in good faith, implying as it does the turning away from a sinful life. It is natural that the ecumenists should be the most sensitive to this problem, the most careful to avoid giving useless offence to non-Catholics. Particularly from the time of Pope Pius XI, papal documents have laid down rules for charity in this field.

These, then, are the chief merits of Catholic ecumenism in the Unity apostolate. I said above that there are also dangers in this method, dangers which some leading Catholic ecumenists have not always taken into account. These dangers were set out in

1949 in an instruction of the Holy Office [8], regulating discussions with non-Catholics. This document instructs that due precaution must be taken against taking up, even in good faith, positions compromising the Church's teaching. In other words we must beware of exaggeration in our kindness to non-Catholics. The encyclical *Humani Generis* reproves that false irenicism which whittles down the basic deposit of faith which all must accept to come to the true unity of the Church. We would also be at fault here if we tried to minimize non-Catholic arguments against the Church by saying that no Pope before 1870 exercised his personal infallibility outside a General Council. One ecumenist, for example, in dealing with the difficulties involved in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception defined in 1854, resolved the question in a way that would leave theologians speechless, by saying that Pius IX consulted the whole episcopate, which was therefore equivalent to a general council. Couturier has been criticised on the same count for certain passages in his Week of Unity formula [9]. For one thing, he never makes clear the intention of the prayers — that they are for unity of all Christians under the authority of the Pope. In like manner, he states categorically in the litanies that all, even non-Catholics, are members of the same Mystical Body, and he quotes St Paul who says that God « has built the church on the apostles and the prophets » with the insertion of the words « Paul and Peter » (in that order) after the word « apostles ».

The other danger to which the Holy Office calls attention is that of dealing with the Reformers in such a way as to veil over their apostasy from the true Church of Christ. Here we must confess that our anxiousness to emphasize the virtues of the Reformers (in itself praiseworthy) has led us at times to picture them as blameless men, and to wonder why they were ever condemned by the Church. The attempted justifications of Nestorius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Eutyches are examples of this tendency. The danger of *communication in sacris* — intercommunion — is not so difficult for us to avoid.

To be frank and practical I should like to add a few words on the effect that the principles of ecumenism should have for Catholics on the question of the freedom of Christian worship. It is easy to deplore and condemn all restriction. That is what Couturier did when Spain legislated against Protestants. We cannot fully discuss this delicate question here, but we must realize to

---

[8] A..A.S. 42 (1950) 142-147.

[9] Cf. Boyer: « The Intentions For the Unity Octave of Prayer » in *Unitas*, No. 2, 1961, p. 81.

what the attitude of Catholic nations often owes its origin. The preaching and propaganda of the sects is generally corrosive; in fact it is really proselytising. It has no room for the non-aggression principle of ecumenism. There are also nations like Greece where the Church is not allowed to try to win adherents, and others, such as England, Sweden, and Norway where the Christian churches are not treated all on an equal footing. My own belief is that Catholic governments would be able at once to allow non-Catholic groups to open churches to serve their own people if they were to desist from their opposition towards those of the Catholic faith.

In accordance with the criteria of ecumenism, Catholics are asked not to strive to win over individual members of other denominations, though of course the region may make a difference. There are places where non-Catholics are not so sensitive to this going over from their own to the Catholic ranks. This is what happened in the Monophysite community of Malabar. Mar Ivanios left this community, and after him about a hundred thousand Christians became Catholics. In a letter to me in 1932 Mar Ivanios said « I look forward in the future to a movement from the East for corporate reunion with the Holy See. In the meantime, however, individual conversions are important; in addition to them we must have a continuous Catholic missionary effort aimed at the corporate reunion of all the non-Catholic Eastern Churches with the Church of Rome ».

There we have an interesting opinion backed by the experience of conditions in Malabar. The effort for individual and collective reunions can be harmoniously combined. In other places prudence dictates otherwise.

In June 1960 Pope John XXIII set up a secretariate to keep non-Catholic bodies informed of the plans for the coming Ecumenical Council, and to receive from them any communications [10]. Both Catholics and other Christian groups welcomed this new step with enthusiasm. It was a new means by which the latter could communicate directly with the Holy See, even if in limited measure. Catholic ecumenists in some strength were called in as members and consultors. They bring to the service of this secretariate a wide circle of friendships with those of other denominations which their persevering zeal has built up over the years.

In this atmosphere of work and prayer we are all preparing for the second Vatican Council. Catholic ecumenism is active in its efforts to remove every unnecessary obstacle to the corporate

---

[10] *A. A. S.* 52 (1960) 436.

reunion of separated bodies. It is a dynamic movement founded on optimism. It fosters love for our separated brethren, and is always ready for peaceful and earnest discussion. As yet this long-desired union of all Christians is not in view, but the Holy Ghost who is the Principle of Unity in the Church is animating with a newer and more cordial spirit the divided Christian communities. Ecumenism today is calling us to work vigorously together to hasten the world-wide reconciliation into the one Church of Christ, founded by Him on the rock of Peter.

I. Ortiz de Urbina S. J.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

The text of Pope John XXIII's Encyclical in Commemoration of St. Leo the Great, dealing with the Unity of the Church

The eternal wisdom of God which « reaches from end to end mightily, and orders all things sweetly » [1] seems to have impressed His image with singular splendor upon the spirit of the Supreme Pontiff, St. Leo I.

This « greatest among the great » [2], as Our predecessor Pius XII of venerable memory rightly called him, appeared to be gifted in extraordinary measure with intrepid strength and paternal goodness. We, called by Divine Providence to occupy the Chair of Peter, which St. Leo the Great made so illustrious with wisdom of government, richness of doctrine, with magnanimity and with his inexhaustible charity, feet it Our duty, Venerable Brothers, on the occasion of the fifteenth centenary or his blessed passing, to recall his virtues and immortal merits, certain as We are that it will contribute notably to the common advantage of souls and the exaltation of the Catholic religion.

The true greatness of this Pontiff is not chiefly bound to the fearless act of courage with which he, unarmed and vested solely with the majesty of Supreme Priest, faced the fierce Attila, king of the Huns, in the year 452, on the banks of the Mincio River and persuaded him to retreat beyond the Danube. It was undoubtedly a most noble gesture, especially worthy of the peaceful mission of the Roman pontificate. But in reality it represents only one episode and is only one indication of a life that was spent entirely for the religious and social welfare, not only of Rome and Italy, but of the universal Church.

The words of Holy Scripture can well be applied to the life and activity of St. Leo: « The path of the just, as a shining light, goes forward and increases even to perfect day » [3]. They apply in considering the three distinct and characteristic aspects of his personality: as faithful servant of the Apostolic See, as Vicar of Christ on earth, and as Doctor of the universal Church.

---

[1] Wisdom, 8, 1.

[2] Cf. Sermon of Oct. 12, 1952, in *Discorsi e Radiomessaggi*, XIV, p. 358.

Faithful Servant of the Holy See

« Leo, Tuscan by birth, son of Quintianus », as the Liber Pontificalis informs us [4], was born toward the end of the fourth century. But, since he lived in Rome from his early youth, he could rightly call Rome his homeland [5]. There, while still a young man, he was inscribed among the Roman clergy and attained the diaconate. In the years 430 to 439 he exercised a considerable influence in ecclesiastical affairs, in the service of Pope Sixtus III. He had friendly relations with St. Prosperus of Aquitania and with Cassianus, founder of the celebrated Abbey of St. Victor in Marseilles. From the latter, who urged him to write *De incarnatione Domini* [6] against the Nestorians, Leo received the truly exceptional praise for a simple deacon: « Honour of the Church and of the sacred ministry » [7].

While he was in Gaul, where he was sent by the Pope on the suggestion of the court of Ravenna to settle the conflict between the patrician Ezio and the prefect Albino, Sixtus III died. It was then that the Church of Rome thought that it could not do better than entrust the power of the Vicar of Christ to the deacon Leo, who had shown himself to be as sound a theologian as he was a fine diplomat.

He then received episcopal consecration on September 29, 440, and his pontificate was one of the longest of the ancient Christian Church and undoubtedly one of the most glorious. He died in November of 461 and was buried in the porch of the Basilica of St. Peter. In 688 Pope St. Sergius I had the remains of the holy pontiff transferred « to the rock of Peter » after the new basilica had been built, and they now rest beneath the altar dedicated to him.

Now, wishing simply to indicate the outstanding characteristic of his life, we can do no less than proclaim that the triumph of the Church of Christ over its spiritual enemies has rarely been so glorious as it was during the pontificate of St. Leo the Great. Truly,in the course of the fifth century he shone in the firmament of Christendom as a shining star. This can in no way be denied, particularly if one takes into consideration the doctrinal field of the Catholic faith. His name is, in fact, certainly linked with those of St. Augustine of Hippo and St. Cyril of Alexandria in this field. If St. Augustine, as all know, stood against the heresy of Pelagius and indicated anew the absolute necessity of grace to live honestly

---

[3] Prov., 4, 18.
[4] Cf. Ed. Duchesne, I, 238.
[5] Cf. Ep. 31, 4, Migne, PL 54, 794.
[6] Migne, PL 59, 9-272.
[7] *De Incarn. Domini, contra Nestorium libr. VII, prol.* PL 50, 9.

and achieve eternal salvation, and if St. Cyril of Alexandria defended against the erroneous affirmations of Nestorius the divinity of Jesus Christ and the divine maternity of the Virgin Mary, then for all effects St. Leo is, on his part, heir of the doctrine of the two distinguished luminaries of the Church of the East and the West, towers over all his contemporaries in the clear affirmation of these fundamental truths of the Catholic faith. And, as St. Augustine is acclaimed in the Church as doctor of grace, and as St. Cyril is acclaimed as doctor of the Incarnation, so St. Leo is celebrated above all as the doctor of the unity of the Church.

Pastor of the Universal Church

It is enough, therefore, to pass rapidly over the prodigious pastoral and writing activities of St. Leo in the long period of his pontificate to arrive at the conviction that he was the proclaimer and defender of the unity of the Church both in the fields of doctrine and discipline.

If one passes into the field of liturgy, it is easy to see that this most pious pontiff promoted the unity of worship, composing or at least inspiring some of the most elevated prayers which are contained in the so-called *Sacramentario Leoniano* [8].

He furthermore intervened with promptness and authority in the controversy over the oneness or duplicity of nature in Jesus Christ, achieving the triumph of the true doctrine concerning the Incarnation of the Divine Word of God. By doing this, he immortalized his name for posterity.

In this respect one must recall the famous Letter to Flavianus, Bishop of Constantinople, in which St. Leo outlined with admirable clarity and propriety the doctrine on the mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God, in conformity with the teaching of the prophets, of the Gospel, of apostolic writings, and of the formula of the Faith [9].

From this letter it seems timely to note the following truly graphic expressions: « The propriety of both natures remaining therefore integral, coming together in the single person, human nothingness was assumed by divine majesty, weakness by power, mortality by eternity; and in order to satisfy the debt of our condition, the inviolable nature was united to a susceptible nature, in such a manner that, as was indeed needed for our salvation, the

---

[8] Migne, PL 55, 21, 156.
[9] Cf. Ibid. 54, 757.

one and irreplaceable mediator between God and man, the man Jesus Christ, could indeed die according to one nature, but not according to the other. Therefore, the Word, though assuming the complete and perfect nature of true man, was born true God, complete in His divine properties, complete also in ours » [10].

Nor did he stop at this. Following his letter to Flavianus, in which he had broadly outlined « all that the Catholic Church believed and taught universally on the mystery of the Incarnation of the Lord » [11], St. Leo condemned the Council of Ephesus of 449. In this council, in which recourse was had to unlawfulness and violence, there was an effort to make triumph the erroneous teaching of Eutychius who, being « very rash and too ignorant » [12], was obstinate in not wishing to recognize any other than the one single nature, the divine, in Jesus Christ.

With good reason the Pope called this council « a theft » [13], because it opposed the clear provisions of the Apostolic See and dared with every means to « damage the Catholic Faith » [14] and to strengthen «the heresy which was completely opposed to the Christian religion » [15].

The name of St. Leo is above all linked with the celebrated Council of Chalcedon of 451, the convocation of which, though requested by the Emperor Marcian, was accepted by the Pope only on condition that it be presided over by his legate [16]. This council, venerable brothers, constitutes one of the most glorious pages in the history of the Catholic Church. But We do not consider it necessary to recall it here in detail, since Our predecessor Pius XII dedicated one of his most famous encyclicals, on the 15th centenary of the event, to this great assembly, in the course of which there triumphed with equal splendor the true faith in the natures of the Incarnate Word and the primacy of the magisterium of the Roman Pontiff [17].

The solicitude of St. Leo for the unity and peace of the Church is evident from the fact that he hesitated to give his approval to the acts of the council. In reality, this hesitation is not to be

---

10 Ibid. col. 759.

11 PL 54, 783.

12 Cf. Ep. 28, PL 54, 756.

13 Cf. *Ep. 95, 2, ad Pulcheriam august.* PL 54, 943.

14 Cf. Ibid.

15 Cf. Ibid.

16 Cf. *Ep. 89, 2, ad Marcianum Imper.* PL 54, 931; *Ep. 103, ad Episcopos Galliarum,* PL 54, 988, 991.

17 Encycl. Letter *Sempiternum Rex,* September 8, 1951, A.A.S. a. XXXXIII, vol. 18, p. 625, 644.

ascribed either to negligence or to any motives of a doctrinal character, but — as he himself declared — to his intention of opposing canon 28 of the acts of the council. In this canon the Fathers of the council, in spite of the protest of the papal legates and with the obvious wish to gain the favor of the emperor of Byzantium, gave recognition to the primacy of the See of Constantinople over all the churches of the East.

This decision appeared to St. Leo to be an affront to the privileges of other more ancient and illustrious churches, which were also recognized by the Fathers of the Council of Nicea. Furthermore, it prejudiced the prestige of the Apostolic See itself. St. Leo clearly perceived that this danger lay more in the spirit which dictated it than in the words of canon 28 itself, as results clearly from two letters, one of which was addressed to him by the bishops of the council [18], and the other sent by him to the emperor.

In the latter, refuting the arguments of the Fathers of the council he admonished the emperor. « The order of the things of the world is one thing, and another those things of God; there can be no stable structure outside of that rock which the Lord set as a foundation (cf. Mat. 16, 18). One who desires that which is not his due impairs his own rights » [19].

The sad history of the schism, which subsequently separated so many illustrious churches of the Christian East form the Apostolic See — as one may gather from the cited passage — goes to clearly demonstrate the well-founded fears of St. Leo regarding the future divisions in the heart of Christianity.

Our exposition of the pastoral zeal of St. Leo for the unity of the Catholic Church would be incomplete if We did not also recall, even though rapidly, his intervention in the question relating to the feast of Easter, as well as his vigilant concern that the relations between the Apostolic See and Christian princes be marked by mutual esteem, trust, and cordiality. With the peace of the Church always in view, he frequently exhorted these princes to cooperate with the episcopate « for full Catholic unity » [20] to merit from God « in addition to the royal crown, also the palm of the priesthood » [21].

---

[18] Cf. C. Kirch, *Enchir. fontium hist. eccl. antiquae*, Friburgi in Br. 4 ed. 1923, n. 943.

[19] *Ep. 104, 3, ad Marcianum Imper.* PL 54, 995; cf. *Ep. 106, ad Anatolium, episc. Constant.* PL 54, 995.

[20] *Ep. 114, 3, ad Marcianum Imper.* PL 54, 1022.

[21] Ibid.

Doctor of the Church

Besides being a most vigilant pastor of the flock of Christ and a courageous defender of the orthodox faith, St. Leo is celebrated through the centuries as a Doctor of the Church, that is, as an exponent and most excellent champion of those divine truths of which every Roman Pontiff is custodian and interpreter.

This is confirmed by the words of Our immortal predecessor Benedict XIV who, in the bull *Militantis Ecclesiae,* with which he proclaimed St. Leo as a Doctor of the Church, formulated this splendid eulogy: « Through his eminent virtue, through his wisdom, through his tireless zeal, he merited from the ancients the name of Leo the Great. The superiority of his doctrine, both in illustrating the highest mysteries of our Faith and in defending them against the rise of errors, as well as in formulating disciplinary and moral directives, to which may be added a singular majesty and richness of priestly eloquence, stands out to such a degree and is distinguished, due to the praise of so many men and to the enthusiastic exaltations of the councils, the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, that a pontiff of such great wisdom is absolutely not to be placed second in fame and esteem to any of the holy doctors who flourished in the Church » [22].

His fame as doctor emerges from the homilies and letters which posterity has preserved for us in considerable numbers. The collection of homilies embraces different questions, almost all connected with the cycle of the sacred liturgy. In these writings he reveals himself not so much as an exegete, dedicated to the exposition of a particular inspired book, nor as a theologian, a lover of deep speculations on divine truths, but rather as a faithful, acute, and prolific exponent of Christian mysteries, conforming to the interpretations handed down by the councils, the Fathers and, above all, by the pontiffs who preceded him.

His style is simple and grave, lofty and persuasive, certainly worthy of being considered a perfect model of classic eloquence. However, he never sacrificed the accuracy of the truth he wished to express for elegance of speech. He did not speak or write to be admired, but to enlighten minds and inflame hearts to perfect conformity of the practices of life with the truths professed.

In the letters, addressed in his capacity as Supreme Pastor to the Bishops, princes, priests, deacons, and monks of the universal Church, St. Leo shows exceptional gifts as a man of government, that is, an enlightened and supremely practical spirit, a will

---

[22] Migne, PL 55, 337-340.

ready for action, firm in well matured decisions, a heart open to paternal understanding and full of that charity that St. Paul indicated to all Christians as « the better way » [23].

How can one not recognize that these sentiments of justice and of mercy, of strength joined with clemency, were born in his heart precisely out of that same charity that the Lord required of Peter before entrusting to him the custody of His lambs and His sheep? [24]

He always strove to make of himself a faithful copy of the Good Shepherd, Jesus Christ, as can be deduced from the following passage: « We have on the one hand meekness and clemency, and on the other strictness and justice. And since all the ways of the Lord are the result of mercy and truth (— fidelity, cf. Ps. 24, 10), we are compelled by the goodness which is proper to the Holy See to regulate our decisions in such manner that — after having pondered the nature of the crimes, the measure of which varies — we consider that some may be absolved and others must be rooted out » [25].

Both the homilies and the letters constitute, therefore, a most eloquent documentation of the thoughts and of the sentiments, of the words and the actions of St. Leo, who was always anxious to insure the good of the Church, in truth, harmony, and peace.

* * *

Venerable brothers, in the imminence of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, in which the Bishops gathered about the Roman Pontiff and in intimate communion with him, will give to the whole world a more shining spectacle of Catholic unity, it is all the more instructive and comforting to recall to mind, even though rapidly, the high idea which St. Leo had of the unity of the Church. This reminder will be at the same time an act of homage to the memory of the most wise Pontiff and, in the coming of the great event ,a spiritual food for the souls of the faithful.

The Unity of the Church in the Thought of St. Leo

St. Leo teaches us above all that the Church is one, because its Spouse, Jesus Christ, is one: « The Church is the bride, united to Christ, her only Spouse, who admits of no error; so that in all the world we enjoy a single union, chaste and integral » [26].

---

23 I Cor, 12, 31.

24 Cf. John 21, 15-17.

25 *Ep. 12, 6, ad Episcopos africanos*, PL 54, 652.

26 *Ep. 80, 1, ad Anatolium, episc. Constant.* PL 54, 913.

The saint believes also that this admirable unity of the Church began with the birth of the Incarnate Word, as emerges from these words: « It is the birth of Christ that determines the origin of the Christian people: the birth of the Head is also the birth of the body. Even if each one of those called (to the Faith) enters in his own turn, if all the children of the Church are distributed in the succession of time, yet the totality of the faithful, born at the baptismal font, are begotten with Him in His birth in the same way as they are crucified with Christ in His Passion, raised up with Him in His Resurrection, and placed at the right hand of the Father in His Ascension » [27].

Mary participated intimately in the mysterious birth of the « body of the Church » [28], through her virginity which was made fruitful by the work of the Holy Spirit. St. Leo exalted Mary as « Virgin, handmaid, and mother of the Lord » [29], as « Genitrix of God» [30], and as perpetual Virgin [31].

The sacrament of Baptism, St. Leo furthermore observes, not only renders each Christian a member of Christ, but renders him also a participant in His regality and His spiritual priesthood: « All those who were regenerated in Christ, are also made king with the sign of the cross and consecrated priest with the anointing of the Holy Spirit » [32]. The sacrament of Confirmation, which he calls « sanctification by chrism » [33], strengthens this assimilation to Christ the Head, while in the Eucharist it finds its completion: « The participation in the Body and Blood of Christ does nothing less than transform us into that which we consume, and we bear with us, in flesh and in spirit, Him Himself in whom we died, were buried and were raised again » [34].

But one must note well that for St. Leo there can be no perfect union of the faithful with Christ the Head, nor union among themselves, as members of the same living and visible organism, if to the spiritual links of virtue, worship, and sacraments there is not added the external profession of the same Faith: « The integral and true Faith is a great bulwark to which nothing can be added or taken from by anyone: if the Faith is not single, it does not exist at all ».

---

27 *Serm. 26, 2, in Nativ. Domini,* PL 54, 213.

28 Col. 1, 18.

29 *Ep. 165, 2, ad Leonem imper.* PL 54, 1157.

30 Cf. Ibid.

31 *Serm. 22, 2, in Nativ. Domini,* PL 54, 195.

32 *Serm. 4, 1, in Nativ. Domini,* PL 54, 149; cf. *Serm. 64, 6, de Passione Domini,* PL 54, 357; *Ep. 69,* 0, PL 54, 870.

33 *Serm. 66, 2, de Passione Domini,* PL 54, 365-366.

34 *Serm. 64, 7, de Passione Domini,* PL 54, 357.

It is indispensable, however, to the unity of the Faith that there be union among the teachers of the divine truths, that is, the harmony of Bishops among themselves in communion and submission to the Roman Pontiff: « The compactness of the whole body is that which gives origin to its sanctity and beauty, and, though this compactness requires unanimity, it requires above all the harmony of its priests. These have priestly dignity in common, but they do not have the same degree of power; because also among the apostles there was equality of honor, but difference of power, inasmuch as the grace of election was common to them all, but the right of preeminence over the others was granted only to one » [36].

The Bishop of Rome, Center of Visible Unity

The center and fulcrum of all visible unity of the Catholic Church, then, is the Bishop of Rome as successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Jesus Christ. The statements of St. Leo are only the faithful echo of the Gospel texts and constant Catholic tradition, as the following passage reveals: « In all the world only Peter is placed over the evangelization of all people, over all the apostles and over all the Fathers of the Church, so that, although there are many pastors and priests in the midst of God's people, all are governed properly by Peter, as all are governed principally by Christ. In a great and marvelous way, oh beloved, the Lord deigned to make this man partaker of His power; and if He wishes that others also should have something in common with Him, He grants all to the others always by means of him » [37].

St. Leo believes it is fitting to insist on this truth which is fundamental to Catholic unity, that is, the divine and indissoluble bond between the power of Peter and that of the other apostles: «This power (to bind and to loose: cf. Matt. 14, 19) was certainly extended also to the other apostles, and it was transmitted to all the heads of the Church, but it was not without purpose that that which was to be communicated to all the others was recommended to one person alone. In fact, this power was entrusted to Peter particularly, exactly because the figure of Peter stands above all those who govern the Church » [38].

But the Holy Pontiff does not forget the other essential bond of the visible unity of the Church, that is, the supreme and in-

---

[35] *Sermo 24, 6, in Nativ. Domini*, PL 54, 207.

[36] *Ep. 14, 11, ad Anastasium, episc. Thessal.* PL 54, 676.

[37] *Serm. 4, 2, di natali ipsius*, PL 54, 149-150.

[38] *Ibid.* col. 151; cf. *Serm. 83, 2, in natali s. Petri Apost.* PL 54, 430.

fallible magisterium reserved by the Lord to Peter personally and to his successors: « The Lord took care of Peter in a special way; He prayed for the faith of Peter in particular, almost as though the perseverance of the others would have been better guaranteed if the soul of their chief would not be overcome. In Peter, therefore, the strength of all is protected, and the assistance of divine grace follows this order: the strength which was given to Peter through Christ is conferred on the other apostles through Peter » [39].

Whatever St. Leo says with such clarity and insistence about St. Peter, he says also about himself. He does not do so through the stimulus of human ambition, but through the deep persuasion that he is, no less than the Prince of the Apostles, the Vicar of Jesus Christ Himself, as can be understood from this excerpt of one of his sermons:

« While being filled with gratitude to God for His gift, we find no reason for pride in solemnly celebrating the anniversary of our priesthood, for we confess with all sincerity that all the good which we may have accomplished in our ministry is the work of Christ and not ours. We can do nothing without Him, and therefore we glory in Him, from whom derives all the efficacy of our work» [40].

In saying this, it is far from St. Leo's mind that St. Peter ever be a stranger to the government of the Church. On the contrary, he wants to associate his trust in the constant assistance of its Divine Founder with his trust in the protection of St. Peter, whose heir and successor he professes to be, and « in whose stead all is done » [41]. He attributes to the merits of the Apostle Peter more than to his own the fruits of his universal ministry. This is clearly indicated, among other things, in the following expression: « If, therefore, we accomplish or see any good, if we obtain anything from the mercy of God with our daily prayers, it is due to his (Peter's) works and merits, whose power perdures in his See and whose authority commands it » [42].

In reality, St. Leo teaches nothing new. Like his predecessors, St. Innocent I [43] and St. Boniface I [44], and in perfect harmony with the well-known Gospel texts upon which he comments (Matt. 16,

---

[39] *Serm. 4, 3,* PL 54, 151-152; cf. *Serm. 83, 2,* PL 54, 451.

[40] *Serm. 5, 4, de natali ipsius,* PL 54, 154.

[41] *Cf. Serm. 3, 4, de nat. ipsius,* PL 54, 147.

[42] *Serm. 3, 3, de nat. ipsius,* PL 54, 146; cf. *Serm. 83, 3, in nat. S. Petri Apos.* PL 54, 432.

[43] *Ep. 30, ad Concil. Milev.* PL 20, 590.

[44] *Ep. 13, ad Rufum episc. Thessaliae,* 11 mart. 422, in C. Silva-Tarouca S. I., *Epistularum Romanorum Pontificium collect. Thessal.* Romae 1937, p. 27.

17; Luke 22, 31-32; John 21, 15-17), he is convinced of having received from Christ Himself the mandate of the supreme pastoral ministry. He declares: « The care that we must have for all the Churches has its origin principally in the divine mandate» [45].

Spiritual Greatness of Rome

No one should marvel, therefore, if St. Leo associates the City of Rome with the exaltation of the Prince of the Apostles. This is how he expresses this association in his sermon in honor of SS. Peter and Paul:

« These, truly, are the heroes, through whose labors, O Rome, the Gospel of Christ shines for you ... It is these who raised you to this glory of being a holy city, a chosen people, a priestly and a royal city. This is done in such manner that, having become truly the head of the world in virtue of the Holy See of Blessed Peter, you might extend your empire more with the divine religion than it was extended with human domination. Although become powerful through many victories, you did indeed affirm your right of empire over land and sea, yet that which the labors of war subjected to you is less than that which Christian peace gave you » [46].

Reminding his listeners, then, of the splendid testimony rendered by St. Paul to the faith of the first Christians of Rome, the great Pontiff urged them with this exhortation to preserve their Catholic Faith from any stain of error:

« You, beloved of God and made worthy of the apostolic approval, to whom the blessed Apostle Paul and doctor of the gentiles said: « Your faith is proclaimed all over the world » (Rom. 1, 8), preserve therefore, in yourselves that which you know he, who exalted you so authoritatively, thought of you. May none of you make yourselves unworthy of this praise, so that not even the impiety of Eutychius may contaminate those who, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have never known any heresy for so many centuries » [47].

The truly outstanding work performed by St. Leo for the safeguarding of the authority of the Church of Rome was not in vain. Due to the prestige of his person, in fact, the « citadel of the Apostle Peter » was praised and venerated not only by the Bishops of the West present at the councils in Rome, but also by more than 500

---

[45] « Curam quam universis Ecclesiis principaliter ex divina institutione debemus ». *Ep. 14, 1, ad Anastasium, episcop. Thessal.* PL 54, 668.

[46] *Serm. 82, 1, in nat. Apost. Petri et Pauli,* PL 54, 422-423.

[47] *Serm. 86, 3, tract. contra haer. Eutychis.* PL 54, 467.

members of the Oriental Episcopate gathered at Chalcedon [48] and by the emperors of Constantinople [49].

Even before the famous council, Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, attributed in 449 to the Bishop of Rome and his privileged flock these high praises:

« Because of the prerogatives which honor your See, yours is the first place of all. Other cities glory in the fact that they are either large or have a great number of inhabitants ... The Giver of every good has poured out His bounty on your city in superabundance, for it is the greatest and most illustrious of all cities, because it rules the world and is rich in population ... Furthermore, you possess the tombs of Peter and Paul, common fathers and masters of truth, who illumine the souls of the faithful. The two most holy luminaries, indeed, had their origin in the Orient and cast their rays everywhere, but by their own choice they suffered death in the West and from there now illuminate the world. These endowed your See greatly; in this is the culmination of your treasures. But their God even now makes their See illustrious, while from your sanctity He brings forth in it the rays of the true faith » [50].

The illustrious praises which the representatives of the Church of the Orient attributed to Leo did not diminish with his death. The Byzantine liturgy, on the feast of February 18 which is dedicated to him, exalts him as « leader of orthodoxy, doctor enhanced with piety and majesty, star of the universe, adornment of the orthodox, harp of the Holy Spirit » [51].

Equally significant are the praises attributed to the great Pontiff by Menologius Gelasianus: « Our father Leo, admirable for his many virtues, continence and purity, consecrated Bishop of the great Rome, did many other things worthy of his virtues: but his work shone above all in that which concerns the honest Faith » [52].

Conclusion

We wish to repeat, Venerable Brothers, that the chorus of praises singing the sanctity of the Supreme Pontiff St. Leo the Great was in ancient times agreed upon both in the East and the West. Oh, may he once more receive the plaudits of all the representatives

---

[48] Mansi, *Concil. ampliss. collect.* VI, p. 913.

[49] *Ep. 100, 3, Marciani imper. ad Leonem, episc. Romae,* PL 54, 972; Ep. 77, *1, Pulcheriae aug. ad Leonem, episc. Romae,* PL 54, 907.

[50] *Ep. 52, 1, Theodoreti episc. ad Leonem, episc. Romae.,* PL 54, 847.

[51] *Menaia tou holou eniautou III,* Roma 1896, p. 612..

[52] Migne, PG 117, 319.

of the ecclesiastical learning of the Churches who are not in communion with Rome.

With the painful differences of opinion about the doctrine and pastoral action of the immortal Pontiff thus overcome, the doctrine which they also profess to believe will shine with greater brilliance: « There is one God and one Mediator between God and men, Himself man, Christ Jesus » [53].

We, having succeeded St. Leo in the episcopal See of St. Peter, as We profess with him faith in the divine origin of the mandate of universal evangelization and salvation entrusted by Jesus Christ to the Apostles and to their successors, so We likewise cherish the great desire to see all peoples enter on the way of truth, charity, and peace.

And it is precisely for the purpose of rendering the Church more capable of accomplishing in our times this great mission that We decided to convene the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council. We did so, confident that the impressive gathering of the Catholic hierarchy would not only strengthen the bonds of unity in faith, worship, and government, which are the prerogatives of the true Church [54], but would also attract the attention of numberless believers in Christ and would invite them to gather about « the great pastor of the sheep » [55], who entrusted their perennial custody to Peter and his successors [56].

Our warm appeal for unity is intended to be, therefore, the echo of that which was made many times by St. Leo in the fifth century, and which was reminiscent of that addressed to the faithful of all the Churches by St. Ireneus, whom Divine Providence called from Asia to govern the See of Lyons and to confirm it with his martyrdom. After having recognized the uninterrupted succession of the Bishops of Rome, heirs of the very power of the two Princes of the Apostles [57], he (Ireneus) concluded, exhorting: « Because of its pre-eminent superiority, it is with this Church that every Church, that is, all the faithful in the universe, must agree; and it is through communion with it that all these faithful (or, all the heads of the Churches) have preserved apostolic tradition » [58].

But Our appeal for unity is intended to be, above all, an echo of the prayer which Our Saviour addressed to His Divine Father at the Last Supper: « That all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me

---

53 I Tim. 2. 5.

54 Cf. Conc. Vat. I, Sess. III, cap. 3 de fide.

55 Heb. 13, 20.

56 Cf. John 21, 15-17.

57 Cf. *Advers. haers.* 1, III, c. 2, n. 2, PG 7, 848.

58 Ibid.

and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us »[59]. There is no doubt about the fulfillment of this prayer, just as the cruel Sacrifice of Golgotha was fulfilled. Did the Lord not say that His Father always hears Him?[60] We, then, believe that the Church for which He prayed and for which He sacrificed Himself on the cross, and to which He promised His abiding presence, has always been and remains one, holy, catholic, and apostolic, just as it was instituted.

Unfortunately, as in the past, We must record with sorrow that also in these times the unity of the Church does not really correspond to the communion of all believers in one single profession of faith and in the same practice of worship and of obedience. However, it is cause of comfort and of fond hope to Us to see those generous and growing efforts done in various parts of the world for the purpose of reconstructing even the visible unity of all Christians, which responds worthily to the intentions, commands and wishes of the Divine Saviour.

Realizing that unity, which is the wish of the Holy Spirit in so many souls of good will, cannot be fully and soundly realized unless it is in conformity with the prophecy of Jesus Christ that « there shall be one fold and one shepherd »[61], We pray Our Mediator and Advocate with the Father[62] that He may give all Christians the grace to recognize the marks of His true Church that they may become its devout children.

Oh, may the Lord grant that the blessed day of universal reconciliation may soon dawn, when an immense chorus of jubilant love will rise from the one and only family of the redeemed and when they, praising the divine mercy, will sing with the Psalmist: « Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity »[63].

The peaceful embrace of the children of the same heavenly Father, equally coheirs of the same reign of glory, will mark the celebration of the triumph of the Mystical Body of Christ.

Venerable Brothers, the 15th centenary of the death of St. Leo the Great finds the Catholic Church in sorrowful conditions which are similar in part to those which it knew in the fifth century. How many sufferings truly afflict the Church in these and resound in Our paternal heart, as the Divine Redeemer clearly predicted!:

---

59 John 17, 21.
60 Cf. John. 11, 42.
61 Ibid. 10, 16.
62 Cf. I Tim. 2, 5; I John 2, 1.
63 Ps. 132, 1.

We see that in many regions the « faith of the Gospel » [64] is in danger, and that there are not wanting attempts — which, thank God, for the most part are doomed to failure — to separate Bishops, priests and faithful from the center of Catholic unity, that is, the Roman See.

Therefore, to check these grave dangers, We confidently invoke upon the Church militant the patronage of the holy Pontiff who wrote, suffered, and did so much for the cause of Catholic unity. And to those who patiently cry after truth and justice, We address the comforting words which St. Leo spoke to the clergy, to the authorities and the people of Constantinople: « Persevere, therefore, in the spirit of Catholic truth, and through Us receive the apostolic exhortation: 'For you have been given the favor on Christ's behalf — not only to believe in Him but also to suffer for Him' » (Phil. 1, 29). [65].

For all those, finally, who live in the Catholic Faith, We who, though unworthily, hold the place of the Divine Saviour on earth, make Ours the prayer which He made for His beloved disciples and for all those who would have believed in Him: « Holy Father ... I pray that they may be perfected in unity » [66].

We, therefore, ask for all the sons of the Church the perfection of unity, that perfection which only charity, « the bond of perfection », [67] can give. It is from a burning love for God and the ever ready, cheerful, and generous practice of all the works of mercy toward one's neigbour that the Church, « temple of the living God » [68] is clothed in each and all of its children with supernatural beauty.

Therefore, with St. Leo We exhort you: « Since, therefore, all the faithful together and separately constitute the one and the same temple of God, it is necessary that it be perfect in each one as it must be perfect in the whole; because, even if the beauty is not equal in all the members, nor the merits equal in such a great diversity of parts, the bond of charity produces the communion in beauty. Those whom a holy love unites, even though they do not share the same gifts of grace, enjoy their benefits mutually, however, and that which they love together cannot be foreign to them, for to find joy in the progress of others increases their own riches » [69].

---

64 Cf. Phil. 1, 27.

65 *Ep. 50, 2, ad Constantinopolitanos,* PL 54, 843.

66 Cf. John 17: 11, 20, 23.

67 Col. 3. 14.

68 Cf. 2 Cor. 6, 16.

69 *Serm. 48, 1, de Quadrag.* PL 54, 298-299.

At the end of this Apostolic Letter of Ours, may We be permitted to renew the ardent wish that came forth from the mind of St. Leo, that is, to see all those redeemed by the Most Precious Blood of Jesus Christ, reunited in the same Church militant, to see them resist, united and fearless, the powers of evil which continue to threaten the Christian faith from so many parts.

Because « the people of God become very powerful when, in the union of holy obedience, the hearts of all the faithful are in agreement, when in the camps of the Christian legions the preparation is the same in all parts and the defenses are the same everywhere » [70]

The prince of darkness shall not prevail as long as love reigns in the Church of Christ: « For the works of the demon will be destroyed with greater power when the hearts of men are burning with love for God and for neighbor » [71].

May the apostolic benediction which We heartily impart to all of you, Venerable Brothers, and to the flock entrusted to each of you, be the comfort of Our hopes and token of divine graces.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, November 11, 1961, the fourth year of Our pontificate.

Pope John XXIII

* * *

A Catholic Appreciation of the Pan-Orthodox Conference at Rhodes

Our readers will remember that the Pan-Orthodox Conference held at Rhodes this past fall was described as having genuine significance for the ecumenical movement of our day. Not only did the meeting serve to strengthen the internal bonds of unity between the Orthodox Churches themselves, but there was a definite preoccupation as well for relations with the other non-Orthodox Christian bodies.

Among the Catholic correspondents who were present on the Island of Rhodes for this historic conference (the first of its kind in over a thousand years) was Fr. John F. Long, S. J. of New York, who represented the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service. Father Long, a specialist in Byzantine Church history, recently drew up a series of four brief, but illuminating, articles

---

[70] *Ep.* 22, 2, PL 54, 441-442.

dealing with the Rhodes Conference for the American Catholic press. In the belief that these would prove interesting for the readers of Unitas, *we are reproducing them below:*

I

The recent Pan-Orthodox Conference on the island of Rhodes brought into the open the differences between various branches of the Orthodox Church. But the conference itself was a sign of a desire for unity.

The head of the Russian Orthodox delegation pointed out that the differences between the various Orthodox bodies were heightened in the past by the close ties between Church and State in many Orthodox countries. But he said that the breaking of these ties gives hope for more united action in the future.

Despite their differences, the Orthodox delegates were able to agree on the agenda for a projected pre-Synod, a meeting which would be the immediate preparation for what would in effect be a general council of the Orthodox Church.

The conference was more widely representative of the various Christian communities of the Eastern tradition than any meeting held in over a thousand years—long before the schism of 1054 severed totally their communion with the Holy See of Rome. The meeting, held from September 23 to October 2, brought together official delegations representing the ancient Orthodox Patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, as well as the younger Patriarchates of Moscow, Serbia, Rumania and Bulgaria.

There were also official representatives of the independent Orthodox Churches of Greece, Cyprus, Poland and Czechoslovakia. The young Orthodox communities of western Europe, North and South America and the Far East were represented by delegates of their mother churches and by unofficial observers. The only Orthodox bodies not represented were the relatively small churches of Albania and Finland, and some groups, principally Russian, which do not maintain relations with their mother communities.

Present, too, were official observers from the ancient Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopian and Syrian Churches, reminders of the great dogmatic struggles which shook the Church in the fifth and sixth centuries. The predominantly Protestant World Council of Churches also had official observers, as did the Anglicans and some other Christian groups. A number of Catholic priests, although not officially representing the Holy See, were present in private capacities.

The importance of a cohesive unity among the Orthodox Churches was repeatedly stressed during the various events of the conference. This theme was quite prominent in the eloquent and moving sermon preached at the opening Liturgy (Mass) by the secretary of the conference, Metropolitan Chrysostom Constantinidis of Myra. Another Archbishop named Chrysostom, the Metropolitan of Philippi, who presided in the name of the Patriarch of Constantinople, stressed it during the course of his opening presidential address.

Speaking for the Russian Orthodox delegation, Archbishop Nikodim of Jaroslav and Rostov praised the efforts being made for unity and emphasized the need for common decisions made in a synod to prevent individual churches and groups from acting against the general interests of Orthodoxy. The heads of the other delegations were no less emphatic.

From all these public pronouncements as well as from private conversations, it was clear that the various Orthodox Churches were keenly aware of their differences on the practical level of concrete action. It was Archibishop Nikodim who put his finger on one main cause of division—the fact that, in the past, « unnatural unions between Church and State led to a lack of fraternal action » among the various churches. Nikodim also stated that there are better chances for closer cooperation since most of the churches are now separated from the State.

A main problem facing the Orthodox churches is the theory of autocephaly. This is the concept that each national church, though bound by ties of faith, worship and adherence to the ancient canons and traditions, is completely independent in its internal government and action.

How to reconcile this cherished idea with the needs for common action was a dominating question at the Rhodes conference. Speaking for the Church of Greece, Metropolitan James of Mytilene brought the question into the open. He stated that although autocephaly has many advantages, its great disadvantage is that it weakens the Church and makes it helpless before a world which, more and more, tends towards common and united action, whether for good or evil. The Rhodes conference was summoned by Patriarch Athenagoras I of Constantinople in his capacity as first among equals. Long years of negotiations had gone into preparing the official convocations.

The Patriarchate of Constantinople, once second only to Rome in an undivided Christendom, had passed through four centuries of harsh subjugation under the Ottoman Empire. It had been torn by internal dissensions and had seen its authority constantly

whittled away by the revolts of national churches in eastern Europe. In this century, however, though its effective authority is still a mere shadow of what it once was, the Patriarchate has seen its moral authority increase a great deal. More and more, the other Orthodox Churches, especially those of the Byzantine traditions, have been willing to rally around it as focal point of united Orthodox action and as a center for the reform and adaptation of the Orthodox Churches to the modern world.

The Russian Orthodox Church, on the other hand, has been slow in joining this movement. Only 50 years ago, it was the largest, richest and most active of the Orthodox Churches. It was the official church of a huge empire with widespread missions in foreign lands and with a voice that was often decisive in the affairs of the other churches.

Now, though it still remains the largest numerically, the Patriarchate of Moscow exists in an officially atheistic state. Its internal problems are a very great burden. The influence it once held in the Orthodox world has diminished considerably.

It has not always been easy for the various Orthodox Churches to adapt themselves to this new situation. One indication of this came during the conference itself. The original program called for the representative of the Patriarch of Constantinople to preside over all sessions. In the first closed plenary session, however, a resolution supported by some Slavic groups was introduced, to elect a president by secret ballot. The precedence of Constantinople would therefore not be recognized. After a heated discussion, this was rejected.

In combatting this resolution, one of the arguments presented by Professor Trembellas of the University of Athens was that, at the Council of Chalcedon in 451, the legates of Pope St. Leo the Great presided over the council as representatives of the first See, even though they were not bishops. Though the Pope had separated from the Orthodox Church, said Professor Trembellas, the principle remained: the first See, now Constantinople, has the right to preside.

Unity among themselves was a prominent question at the Pan-Orthodox Conference of Rhodes. At the beginning, there was definite tension in the air as the various national groups sought to feel each other out. There was apprehension about how the Greek groups would get along with the Slavic ones and, in particular, what the actions of the Russian delegation might be.

This tension lessened considerably as the days went on. Personal contacts among the delegates contributed to this. A common determination to make the conference succeed was evident. Fur-

thermore, the delegations from behind the Iron Curtain did not act as a monolithic bloc. Some of them, in fact, were definitely opposed to the resolution for electing a president and voted against it.

Archbishop Nikodim, head of the Russian delegation, did make a long speech in which he criticized the Vatican and made remarks reminiscent of statements coming from the Kremlin. His remarks were duly noted and were taken into account in the final wording of some of the resolutions but they did not affect the general attitude of the conference. Nor did the Archbishop press them too much.

Everyone seemed determined to arrive at some common action.

The conference accomplished a great deal by bringing together representatives of the different Churches and helping them to see their common bonds and common problems. The common recitation of the Nicene Creed at the closing session was a moving experience, especially as it came spontaneously and had not been provided for in the program.

The conference achieved unanimous agreement on the problems which must be discussed in a future pre-Synod. The pre-Synod will determine whether the Orthodox will advance on the road of greater internal unity, which could also lead to unity with other Christians, or whether they will remain divided by national and cultural rivalry.

II

There is a new breeze blowing amidst the long-isolated Orthodox Churches, and it promises to bring Orthodoxy to grips with the problems of the modern world.

The conference which brought representatives of virtually all of the world's 170 million Orthodox together on the island of Rhodes at the end of September laid great emphasis on internal unity for these long divided communions. But it was no less emphatic in its insistence on the adaptation of Orthodoxy to present-day problems.

Such an adaptation has been late in coming. Historical reasons go a long way to explain this. Foreign domination, lack of an educated clergy and laity, and national rivalries and local bitterness all contributed their bit.

The Orthodox have been their own severest critics of various traditions and practices of their churches which have made it difficult for them to carry on their life in the present century.

The effects of this criticism and the desires of the delegates to meet the problems are made evident by the list of topics officially adopted by the conference.

The purpose of the meeting was to determine what are the main problems facing the Orthodox Churches, and what questions have arisen that demand answers. This list — to be the agenda of a Pre-Synod of the Orthodox Church which is to be held in three or four years —was given unanimous approval by the delegates. It now goes to the various branches of the Orthodox communion for study and comment.

The conference took up a number of problems related to religious practice as such. Among them were these:

1. In a church justly famed for its liturgical and sacramental life, there still seems to be a definite need for reform in these fields. The participation of laymen in the liturgy and especially their reception of the sacraments leaves much to be desired. Frequent Communion is a rarity, as is intelligent assistance at the liturgical services. Certain movements to correct this have already developed in the church of Greece. Good efforts in the same direction are being made by Orthodox in Western Europe and in America. The conference of Rhodes expressed the desire that these and similar movements be organized and spread through all the Orthodox churches.

2. The monastic life, once the glory of the ancient Church of the East, has fallen upon hard times. Vocations are few, and the spirit of observance leaves much to be desired. There are indeed many individual instances of great fervor and intense spiritual life. But the general level of monastic life is quite low. The conference has asked for a revival of the ancient spirit and for a greater observance of monastic traditions. Of particular importance is the desire it expressed to see the monks take up once again the activities in and for the Church which, in earlier ages, contributed so much to the theological and spiritual life of the entire Church.

3. Americans are used to meeting an Orthodox clergy which is generally well educated. The emphasis put by the conference on the education of the clergy is due mostly to the situation in the Old World, frequently critical. In Greece, a vast majority of the parish clergy has had nothing more than a high school education and some months of special training. Some of them have not even had that.

In Russia, where formerly there existed a good system for training the clergy, the revolution of 1917 was also a great ca-

tastrophe in this field. At present, the vast majority of the clergy have not been able to attend seminaries. Efforts have been made to train them through correspondence courses, not always with success. According to reliable sources, Archbishop Nikodim, who headed the Russian delegation, is himself a product of this correspondence school.

The conference was not able to take care of the special circumstances behind the Iron Curtain since these are often beyond the control of the churches. It did insist strongly on an adequate education of the young clergy where this is possible. It called for remedial courses in theology and for institutes and congresses which will keep the priests informed on current topics and deepen their personal knowledge.

4. The conference remained firm on the Orthodox tradition that priests cannot marry after ordination. There has been some agitation to allow the marriage or remarriage of priests after their ordination and the subject was included in the tentative program. However, strong opposition to this change in a very ancient tradition soon developed and the conference decided to leave it off the official list of proposals to the Pre-Synod.

5. Many of the problems faced by all Christians in the modern world — youth, marriage, the family, birth control, euthanasia — are to be found on the list, usually without comment. A number of items are interesting, though, because of the discussion they provoked.

In his statement of policy, Russian Archbishop Nikodim objected to the proposed item on foreign missions because, in his opinion, these have always been identified with colonialism. He asked that the condemnation of atheism be excluded since this would take care of itself if each local church did its duty. (A formal condemnation of atheism by name seems to be against Article 124 of the Soviet constitution and could cause further trouble for the Church there.)

The Archbishop further asked for an approval of the « peace » movements, a condemnation of racism and colonialism, and the approval of efforts being made by peoples and nations to develop new political, social, and economic systems.

While these proposals seemed to have a certain Christian sense, they were presented in such form that they sounded to the conference too much like the statements of Soviet propagandists. In a masterful way, the members were able to satisfy the Archbishop and still remove the sting of communist propaganda.

On the missions, the proposal now reads: « the spread of the teaching of the Gospel throughout the world according the Ortho-

dox tradition ». On atheism there has been substituted: « the means of bearing witness to Orthodoxy in the world according to tradition ».

The other proposals have been transformed to: « the contribution of local Orthodox churches to the triumph of the Christian ideals of peace, freedom, brotherhood and love among nations »; « Orthodoxy and racial discrimination »; and « Orthodoxy and the problems of Christians in the face of many sudden social transformations ».

The delegates' handling of the various problems confronting the conference was a sure sign of their genuine intent on seeking both greater unity and a confrontation with the challenges of the day.

Orthodox clergy and laity alike are coming out of the shells where they have lived too long; the laity is moving forward to assume an important role in the movement.

Some things that have brought home the significance of a general reform for the Orthodox churches are:

The shock of modern ideas; the challenges of anti-Christian ideologies; the emigration of Orthodox Christians from their national homelands to form flourishing communities in Western Europe, the two Americas, and Africa ;and the ecumenical movement itself.

The influence of all these factors was felt at Rhodes. The Pan-Orthodox Conference was but the first step on the road toward a necessary reform. Orthodox and non-Orthodox alike now look forward to the Pre-Synod to give added impetus and direction to the movement.

III

The need for a united Christian front against the forces of materialism and unbelief in the world exerted a real influence at the Pan-Orthodox Conference on the island of Rhodes.

The question of unity kept coming up in public speeches, in press interviews and in private conversations. The presence of observers, official and unofficial, from virtually every major group in Christendom gave this question a new immediacy for the Orthodox.

The conference did not answer the question. That was not its purpose. But it did devote a great deal of time and energy to preparing for the discussions which will take place in the pre-synod projected for some time within the next four years. One indica-

tion of this was the fact that two of the six commissions set up to handle the work of the conference were devoted entirely to the question of relations with other Christians.

The relations of the Orthodox Churches to those groups which resulted from the schisms of the fifth and sixth centuries are very special ones.

To a great extent, they live in the same areas of the world. They shared centuries of Moslem oppression. With the exception of Ethiopia and South India, many Orthodox find themselves living as minority groups alongside of the ancient Nestorian and Monophysite communities, mostly in countries where Arab — and Moslem — nationalism is a growing force. The need, and the desire, to overcome ancient national and religious animosities is becoming increasingly strong.

Some steps have already been taken in the various countries of the Near East to bring about greater collaboration. The Rhodes conference asked that these programs of visits, exchanges of professors and students, and theological contacts be strengthened and put on a more permanent basis.

Two other proposals were made by the conference. It asks that the pre-synod establish means of regular collaboration with the ancient Eastern Churches in the various ecumenical meetings held around the world. These churches are « catholic » in many of the basic elements of their faith, worship and traditions. Joined in close relationship with the Orthodox, they would be able to make the testimony to ancient traditions of Christianity more forceful in such meetings as the General Assembly of the World Council of Churches.

Secondly, there was an express desire for closer cooperation on the practical level. In the field of Christian education, relations with governments and the solution of social problems would give the Christian communities in the Near East a strength they badly need.

The final proposal of the conference — that there be a serious study of history, faith, worship and ecclesiastical administration of these churches — looks forward to their organic unity with Orthodoxy. There seemed to be general agreement that theological problems can be settled without too much difficulty. However, the results of centuries of animosity on the cultural and national level remain. At a time when the Orthodox themselves are seeking a greater uniformity in worship and in church administration, it may be difficult to enter into full communion with churches possessing other rites and different types of organization.

One of the Eastern prelates attending the conference voiced

the hope that his Church would be able to participate in the coming pre-synod as a full-fledged member. The many problems of a practical and psychological nature appear too great for his wish to be realized by then. But the Pan-Orthodox Conference of Rhodes took a definite step forward towards its ultimate fulfilment.

Emphasis was given to the possibility of close union with the Old Catholic groups — various national bodies which have split from the Holy See in the past two centuries but have retained many elements of Catholic Faith and worship. There have already been a number of meetings in the past to explore the possibility of unity with the Old Catholics and there is a distinct likelihood that further meetings can achieve positive results. One factor that might cause a delay, however, is the close ties between the Old Catholics and the Anglicans. The Old Catholics have been in full communion with the Church of England since 1932.

Special consideration was given to the Episcopal and other Anglican Churches. Relations between the Orthodox and these Churches have always been good. Mutual cooperation has been particularly evident since the beginning of this century. The Orthodox Churches feel much closer to the Anglicans than they do to evangelical groups. The conference did not rule out the possibility of fruitful contacts with other Protestant bodies, however.

If not much was said officially about relations with individual Protestant groups, a great deal of thought has been given to the ecumenical movement itself. Individual Orthodox Churches have participated in the movement since its very beginning. During all this time, though, there has been a division within Orthodoxy on the attitude to be taken towards the movement.

The Patriarchate of Constantinople has had many friendly contacts with the ecumenical movement and maintains an official representative at the headquarters of the World Council of Churches in Geneva. The Church of Greece, once enthusiastic, has become more reticent. It allows lay theologians to take active part in meetings but frowns on clerical participation.

On the other hand, the Russian Patriarchate which, in 1948, solemnly condemned the World Council of Churches has now swung around to another position. It has petitioned to join that group and will most certainly be admitted at the general assembly in New Delhi at the end of November [1]. The Polish Orthodox Church is expected to do likewise.

---

[1] The World Council of Churches has since held its Third General Assembly during which the Russian Orthodox application for membership was approved.

The Rhodes conference participants wanted to see these divergencies reconciled and asked the pre-synod to decide upon a united plan of action. Particularly interest was shown in possibilities for influencing the ecumenical movement by injecting more of a Catholic spirit into its ideology and activities. More than once, and not without irony, Orthodox representatives asserted that they carry a double burden — their own and that of the Roman Catholics — in trying to carry out this program.

With the Protestant section of Christendom there was no talk of any organic union as there was with the ancient Eastern churches. The differences between Orthodoxy and Protestantism are too great. But the conference was convinced that there is a great field for fruitful cooperation between the two groups, and it asked the pre-synod to strengthen and develop such relations.

IV

The coming Second Vatican Council received no official notice during the Pan-Orthodox Conference of Rhodes. But the Orthodox did call for a study of the Catholic position on matters of faith and practice.

The coming council at the Vatican was indeed the subject of private discussion in the course of the Rhodes meeting. Among the reasons there was no official acknowledgement were a general uncertainity as to the exact work of the council and the relationship the Orthodox will have with it.

Up to the present, the Orthodox Churches have had no solid contact with the work of the council except for the visit of a papal mission to Patriarch Athenagoras I of Constantinople last June 20.

The visit was made by Archbishop Giacomo Testa, former Apostolic Delegate to Turkey and now president of the Pontifical Ecclesiastical Academy in Rome; Archbishop Francesco Lardone, present Apostolic Internuncio to Turkey, and Father Alphonse Raes, S. J., president of the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome.

Purpose of the visit was to notify Patriarch Athenagoras formally that His Holiness Pope John XXIII will convene the council. It was also described as a gesture of appreciation on the part of the Pope for the Patriarch's personal interest, and a means to present the Orthodox leader with a collection of documents concerning the council.

There has been no announcement from Rome concerning a final decision on inviting non-Catholic Christians to the council.

The Orthodox delegates in Rhodes generally appreciated the fact that the question is a complicated one demanding careful consideration. Many felt, however, that after two and a half years of preparatory work, some decision could have been reached whereby the representatives of their churches might have been kept informed of the work done and be able to express some of their own ideas.

They recognized that the council is to be essentially an affair of the Roman Catholic Church. They see also that present conditions make it impossible for them to assist as full members.

But it was a common feeling that the council will also have a bearing on the entire Christian world and, more particularly, on the question of inter-Christian relations. The words of Pope John have encouraged them in this attitude. They would like some clarification of the situation so that they might find a way to make themselves heard officially, especially on questions which affect their own relations with the Catholic Church.

It is this uncertainity on the matter and the delicacy of the question itself which explain in part why the Second Vatican Council was not mentioned in the official report of the conference. Another explanation lies in the fact that the Orthodox delegates themselves were not united in their attitude towards the council.

Early in the conference, Archbishop Nikodim of the Patriarchate of Moscow came out flatly against any collaboration by the Orthodox with the work of the council. He coupled theological arguments — that the Catholic dogmas of papal primacy and infallibility are so extreme as to make all discussion useless unless Rome would renounce these doctrines — with veiled references to the Vatican as using the movement towards unity as a means of subjugating all Christians to its own sway, and as supporting imperialism, colonialism and capitalism.

Though the Archbishop repeated his « non possumus » a number of times in public, the members of his delegation were less categoric in private conversations. They fell back on their lack of knowledge about the council to justify an attitude of « wait and see ».

How much the Russian Orthodox were thinking of theological reasons for explaining their lack of cooperation and how much they were under pressure because of the situation in the Soviet Union, it is hard to say. Some delegates at Rhodes felt that, though they could not agree with the extreme statement made by the head of the Russian delegation, they should give them every benefit of the doubt, recognizing their precarious situation under a militantly atheistic government.

Some also observed that only 13 years ago the Patriarchate of Moscow condemned the World Council of Churches, again for theological reasons. Yet its application for membership in the same council was up for consideration by the recent World Council assembly at New Delhi. A similar change of policy with regard to the Holy See is not beyond the realm of possibility.

The Russian attitude towards the Catholic Church was certainly not shared by other delegates to the conference, not even by some of those from other churches behind the Iron Curtain. Many were of the opinion that the definitions of the First Vatican Council make organic reunion impossible.

However, these felt that this does not rule out greater understanding and cooperation on many fronts. Some went even further in expressing the hopes that the coming Vatican council might be able to develop and explain the definitions on papal primacy and infallibility in such a way as to make them more acceptable to the Orthodox.

The final list of topics to be presented to the projected Orthodox pre-synod reflects this split in the attitude of the various Orthodox Churches. No mention is made of the Second Vatican Council. But the pre-synod is asked to study the possibility of friendly relations in the light of present tendencies towards drawing the two groups together.

One change was made in the original program. The question of « The examination of points of disagreement » between Catholics and Orthodox had been proposed. The conference amended this to read « an examination of points of agreement and disagreement between the two churches regarding 1) faith, 2) administration and 3) ecclesiastical activity (especially propaganda, proselytism and the uniate movement) ». The willingness to consider these topics in a larger context should help for more fruitful discussions.

The points mentioned on the list underline those subjects which the Orthodox feel must be discussed most. They speak often of the centralization of the government of the Catholic Church and the emphasis on what they call external authority.

They contrast what they consider to be their own unity in equality and love with the «juridical » unity of the Catholic Church. These phrases often appeared in the speeches that were delivered and in the final message of the conference, though the comparison was never made directly.

The many statements of recent popes on the possibility of reunion, with the preservation intact of all their rites, privileges and customs, have not had a very great effect. The Orthodox can

always cite the words and actions of other Catholics, clerical and lay, which seem to nullify the solemn promises of the popes.

Even well informed people among them felt that, though the popes have been sincere in their words, the Catholic Church as a whole was not ready to support them and that, in the day to day life of ordinary relations, Orthodoxy would have been swallowed up by the larger and much more powerful Latin Christianity.

This explains, too, the inclusion of such specific terms as propaganda, proselytism and the uniate churches. In the days of foreign domination in the Near East and the Balkans, the Orthodox saw Latin Rite missionaries, supported by the political power and wealth of Western Europe, coming to found schools, hospitals and social organizations.

While conceding that these organizations did good work, they refuse to believe that one of the main reasons for their foundation was not to entice simple Orthodox people away from the faith of their ancestors.

They consider the uniate churches — bodies maintaining the old Byzantine liturgy and traditions, but in communion with the Holy See rather than the local Orthodox patriarch — a deliberate policy of Rome to bore from within.

One influential prelate at Rhodes, who studied at Catholic institutions in Western Europe and who is considered to be one of the Orthodox bishops most open and most friendly towards Catholicism, dismissed the uniate churches with the words: « They are a scandal ». An emotional reaction, perhaps, but representative of the feelings of the vast majority of Orthodox.

It will take years of patient discussion and understanding on both sides to overcome these emotional fears and reactions of the Orthodox to Catholic efforts for reunion. However, signs of the development of a new attitude could be discerned at Rhodes. Many members expressed their hope and their desire that Catholic and Orthodox might put the past behind them and search out new ways of bringing together these two great sections of Christendom.

The attitude of Pope John XXIII has encouraged many Orthodox. Through the work of the coming Second Vatican Council and of their own pre-synod and synod, they see the possibility of a truly fruitful development of relations, especially if there can be official cooperation between the two groups in the work of these great assemblies.

* * *

The Message of the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches

The Third Assembly of the WCC meeting in New Delhi addresses this letter to the member churches and their congregations. We rejoice and thank God that we experience here a fellowship as deep as before and now wider. New member churches coming in considerable numbers and strength from the ancient Orthodox tradition of Eastern Christendom and from Africa, Asia, Latin America and other parts of the world visibly demonstrate that Christianity now has a home in every part of the world. In this fellowship we are able to speak and act freely, for we are all partakers together with Christ. Together we have sought to understand our common calling to witness, service, and unity.

We are deeply grateful for the prayers of countless Christian people and for the study of our theme « Jesus Christ, the Light of the World » by which many of you have shared in our work. Now we return to our churches to do, with you, the things that have been shown to us here.

All over the world new possibilities of life, freedom, and prosperity are being actively, even passionately pursued. In some lands there is disillusionment with the benefits that a technically expert society can produce; and over all there hangs the shadow of vast destruction through war. Nevertheless, mankind is not paralysed by these threats. The momentum of change is not reduced. We Christians share men's eager quest for life, for freedom from poverty, oppression and disease. God is at work in the opening possibilities for mankind in our day. He is at work even when the powers of evil rebel against Him and call down His judgement. We do not know by what ways God will lead us: but our trust is in Jesus Christ who is now and always our eternal life.

When we speak to men as Christians we must speak the truth of our faith: that there is only one way to the Father, namely Jesus Christ, His Son. On that one way we are bound to meet our brother. We meet our brother Christian. We meet also our brother man; and before we speak to him of Christ, Christ has already sought him.

Christ is the way, and therefore we have to walk together witnessing to Him and serving all men. This is His commandment. There is no greater service to men than to tell them of the living Christ and no more effective witness than a life offered in service. The indifference or hostility of men may check our open speaking, but God is not silenced. He speaks through the worship and the suf-

ferings of His Church. Her prayers and patience are, by His gracious acceptance of them, made part of the witness He bears to Christ.

We need to think out together in concrete terms the forms of Christian service for today and together act upon them. In no field has Christian co-operation been more massive and effective than in service to people in every kind of distress. There is no more urgent task for Christians than to work together for community within nations and for peace with justice and freedom among them, so that the causes of much contemporary misery may be rooted out. We have to take our stand against injustice caused to any race, or to any man on account of his race. We have to learn to make a Christian contribution to the service of men through secular agencies. Christian love requires not only the sharing of worldly goods but costly personal service. All over the world young people are giving an example in their spontaneous offering of themselves.

We must together seek the fulness of Christian unity. We need for this purpose every member of the Christian family, of Eastern and Western tradition, ancient churches and younger churches, men and women, young and old, of every race and every nation. Our brethren in Christ are given to us, not chosen by us. In some things our convictions do not yet permit us to act together, but we have made progress in giving content to the unity we seek. Let us therefore find out the things which in each place we can do together now; and faithfully do them, praying and working always for that fuller unity which Christ wills for His Church.

This letter is written from the World Council of Churches' Assembly. But the real letter written to the world today does not consist of words. We Christian people, wherever we are, are a letter from Christ to His world « written not with ink but with the spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts ». The message is that God in Christ has reconciled the world to Himself. Let us speak it and live it with joy and confidence « for it is the God who said ' Let light shine out of darkness ' who has shone in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ ».

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Pope John XXIII Proclaims Ecumenical Council for 1962

On Christmas Day, in the course of a brief ceremony which took place in the throne room of the Vatican Palace, there was consigned to Pope John XXIII for his signature the Bull proclaiming the Second Vatican Council. Subsequently the Holy Father presented the document for its public reading to Msgr. Pericle Felici, general secretary of the Central Preparatory Commission for the coming ecumenical council. Later that same day, in the atrium of St. Peter's Basilica in the presence of the Chapter and of a large gathering of people, Monsignor Felici read aloud the contents of the proclamation which made it known that the General Council was to take place some time in 1962 after nearly three years of intensive preparation.

As was generally expected, the Pope officially indicated that the Second Vatican Council will consider questions relating to Sacred Scripture, to tradition, the Sacraments, the liturgy, ecclesiastical discipline, charitable enterprises, the lay apostolate, and the missions.

That the cause of Christian unity is still very much a preoccupation of Pope John is revealed in those pasages in which the theme is touched upon. He notes that « many generous efforts are being made to restore the visible unity of all Christians in accordance with the will of the divine Redeemer » and then goes on to say that « it is only natural that the forthcoming Council will bring with it promises of doctrinal clarity and mutual charity which will make the wish for the return to unity all the more strong in the separated brethren, and will smooth out the way towards it ».

« The coming Council », the Holy Father continues, « will offer all men of good-will the possibility of laying down proposals for peace — a peace which can and must come from the spiritual and supernatural truths, from human intelligence and conscience enlightened and guided by God, Creator and Redeemer of mankind ».

The papal document directs an appeal to prayer to all Chris-

tians in general: « We invite all Christians belonging to churches which are separated from Rome to join in this chorus of prayer ... We know that many of them are longing to return to unity and peace in accordance with the prayer of Christ. We know, too, that they have not only welcomed the news of the Council with joy, but that many of them have promised to pray for its success and hope to send representatives from their churches to observe its work. All that is a great source of comfort and hope to us. It is precisely in order to facilitate these contacts that we have set up a Secretariat ».

Among other things, the Pope declares that the Church desires « to fortify its faith, and gather together in its marvellous unity, just as it feels the urgent duty to give greater efficiency to its healthy vitality and to promote the sanctification of its members, the spread of revealed truth, and the consolidation of its structure ».

« Therefore », concludes the Father, « after having heard the opinion of our brothers, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, with the authority of Our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and our own authority, we indight, announce, and convene for the coming year 1962 the Ecumenical and General Council which will be celebrated in the Vatican Basilica on days which will be specified according to the opportunity which divine Providence will extend to us ».

* * *

The World Council of Churches Holds Third Assembly at New Delhi

In what marked one of the most imposing manifestations of Christian solidarity in the twentieth century, the long-heralded Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches was held at New Delhi, India, from November 19 to December 6. Having as its general theme « Jesus Christ, the Light of the World », the Assembly was inaugurated with a solemn and colorful procession and a joint Sunday service in which many prominent church leaders from all over the world took part. Among them was the Most Reverend Arthur Michael Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury and spiritual leader of the 40-million member Anglican Communion, and the Rt. Reverend Arthur Lichtenberger, Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, who had visited His Holiness Pope John XXIII at the Vatican the previous week.

The service began with a hymn common to both Protestant

and Catholic hymnals, « Praise to the Lord, the Almighty, the King of Creation». Lutheran Bishop Otto Dibelius, for a long time head of the Evangelical Church of Berlin and presiding Protestant Bishop of Germany read a lesson from Sacred Scripture; and Archbishop Iakovos, head of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, led the congregation in the recitation of the Nicene Creed. The closing intercession was given by Bishop Henry Knox Sherrill, until recently the leader of the Episcopal Church in the United States.

One of the major addresses at New Delhi was that delivered at the inaugural session by the general secretary of the World Council of Churches, Dr. W. A. Visser't Hooft. He told representatives of most of the world's 350 million non-Catholic Christians that while the drive for Christian unity is gathering momentum, there is no sign that basic problems are about to be solved. He declared that today the desire for that unity is « no longer the concern of the few but the preoccupation of the many ». One decisive motive for the emergence of the trend towards unity, according to Dr. Visser 't Hooft, is a sense of shame and repentance at the failure of the churches to serve as guardians of the conscience of nations.

The Dutch Reformed theologian said further that the timing of the Pan-Orthodox Conference on the Island of Rhodes last September and the proximity of the Second Vatican Council give an impression of a general mobilization for Christian reunion. But, he pointed out, this can be dangerous, as it creates hopes that cannot be fulfilled under the present circumstances.

In the course of his address, the general secretary of the W. C. C. welcomed the presence of the Holy See's five observers — the first official Catholic delegation to a World Council assembly — and said that profitable contacts between the World Council and the Catholic Church are growing.

Two major questions confronting the Third Assembly were resolved in the early stages of the 18-day congress. They were the incorporation of the 51-year-old International Missionary Council into the World Council, and the admission of the Russian Orthodox Church and other Orthodox bodies behind the Iron Curtain to membership. The Assembly voted unanimously in favor of admitting the Protestant missionary body and changed the World Council constitution to make the former IMC a new World Council division on missions and evangelism.

The Russian Orthodox Church and its sister churches of Poland, Bulgaria, and Romania were admitted to World Council membership with little visible opposition. Archbishop Nikodim of Ya-

roslav and Rostov, head of the sixteen-member committee from the Orthodox Patriarchate of Moschow, was quoted two days before the Assembly opened as stating that no Christian can be a communist and that « a communist must be an atheist ».

In his address prior to the vote on the Russian Orthodox application, Dr. Visser 't Hooft had said that the admission of the Russian group would represent a major event in the history of the ecumenical movement: It would mean that the World Council was reckoning not only with ancient divergences between the Christian East and the Christian West but also with modern tensions between the political East and the political West.

Concerning the World Council itself, the general secretary said that its goal is not to become « the one body with a clear voice » in matters of faith, life, or church order. Its goal rather is to pave the way for a fuller manifestation of Christian unity at both local and world levels. « Let no one say », he stated, « that this is a wild dream or that it will lead automatically to the formation of a wholly uniform or centralized superchurch ».

Appeals for Christian unity arose from both Orthodox and Protestant leaders at the Third Assembly of the World Council which bands together virtually all the world's non-Catholic Christian faiths.

Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras of Constantinople in a message to the delegates declared: « It is in our own unity that the world will be enabled to evaluate the real meaning of brotherhood and hope and assurance of a new epoch in Christ ». He urged all Christians regardless of their confessions to understand and to act on the « quest of our times, which is our unity in Christ ».

A theologian from the United States echoed the Patriarch's call and asked for emphasis on unity of faith rather than mere unity of organization:

« The church has found a melancholy number of ways to express her variety », commented Dr. Joseph A. Sittler, Jr., professor of systematic theology at the University of Chicago, in a keynote address to the Assembly. « She has found fewer ways to express her unity. But if we are indeed called to unity and if we can obey that call in terms of a contemporary Christology, expanded to dimensions of the New Testament vision, we shall perhaps obey into fuller unity ».

Anglican Archbishop Michael Ramsey of Canterbury said that the search for holiness is essential for the achievement of unity: « It is useless to think that we can look for unity in Christ's name unless we are looking no less for holiness in His obedience and for the realization of the truth which He has revealed », the An-

glican primate noted. He warned further against thinking that « just a few simple facts and principles » are all that is needed for unity.

The Ethiopian statement, read to the Assembly by Bishop Theophilos, suggested close study of the traditional doctrines with a view to defining them more clearly. The Ethiopian prelate also deplored « sheep stealing » or proselytizing among Orthodox Christians by other Christian denominations. He pointed out, further, that Christianity is in danger of being regarded as a « white man's religion » in Africa.

A declaration by Patriarch Alexis of Moscow, ranking prelate of the Russian Orthodox Church, was read to the Assembly shortly after his church was voted into membership in the World Council. He called for concerted action by all Christians to get the world's leaders into a disarmament conference. The Patriarch said further that the Russian Orthodox Church is aware of the difficulties along the road to unity of all Christians, but is prepared to do what it can in that direction within the W. C. C.

Some groups within the Council raised serious question about the advisabilty of admitting the Russian Church. A member of the Council's Central Committee said fears that the Russian Orthodox would try to infuse Soviet ideology into the inter-church body had been studied and set aside.

Twenty-two other churches desides the Russian Orthodox Church were admitted to membership during the eighteen-day Assembly. This brought total membership from 175 church bodies to 198. Only 146 member churches were included in the World Council of Churches at the time of its formation at the first Assembly in Amsterdam in 1948. Now more than 350.000,000 Christians of 60 nations are represented.

It was evident at New Delhi that the Orthodox Churches have committed themselves more fully to the World Council and its efforts for Christian unity. This interest was reflected in the decisions they made in the various sessions, in the statements of Orthodox leaders, and in the election of seventeen Orthodox delegates to the World Council's Central Committee. The election now gives the Orthodox the highest representation in the 100-member committee which is the policy-making body of the W. C. C.

At the same time, Archbishop Iakovos, head of the Greek Orthodox Church in the Americas, was re-elected one of the six presidents of the World Council, the only one of the former presidium to be so honored. (The other new presidents are: Dr. A. Michael Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury; Dr. Martin Niemoller, president of the Evangelical Church of Hesse-Nassau, Germany; Dr, Da-

vid G. Moses of India, vicepresident of the former International Missionary Council; Sir Francis Ibiam, governor of the Eastern Province of Nigeria and a Presbyterian leader there; and Mr. Charles Parlin, a prominent Methodist layman of the United States).

Three days before his election, Archbishop Iakovos had announced that henceforth the Orthodox delegations would no longer issue their own minority statements on the question of unity, unless it should become absolutely necessary. This was a decided break from past policy.

« We now have more confidence in the ecumenical movement and a fuller committment in its work, » said the Archbishop. « We intend to make a positive contribution ».

He hailed what he called a new climate of Christian unity. He spoke of the spirit of unity in Rome and said that His Holiness Pope John XXIII unceasingly prays and works for the restoration of Christian unity.

Dr. Nikos Nissiotis, Greek Orthodox theologian who is assistant director of the World Council's Ecumenical Institute at Geneva, declared that the « wind of the Holy Spirit is driving us forward (toward unity) with pressing urgency ».

Dr. Nissiotis, a layman, observed that « unity is not an attribute of the Church, but it is its very life... We are not here to create unity but to recapture it in its vast universal dimensions ».

The Orthodox theologian said further that the Eastern Churches nover denied that the Pope, Bishop of Rome, has primacy as the « first among equals ». « But », he continued, « in the service of unity we must now rethink our conceptions of this primacy. We must regard it as a response to the desires of the local churches for an initiative in convening pan-Christian councils and for a link between the churches such as the Patriarchate of Constantinople provides for the Eastern Churches today ».

The Orthodox in their witness for unity « must include psychological and theological preparation for the restoration of this function of the undivided Church as one of the most fundamental means of preserving unity », he said.

« We must hope and pray », concluded Dr. Nissiotis, « that the Second Vatican Council will re-evaluate the diocesan system by a reinterpretation of the primacy of the Holy See, in the full Catholic and Orthodox sense... ».

Other reflections on Christian unity were expressed at one of the earlier sessions by Dr. Ramsey, the Anglican Primate. Speaking on the topic of « Faith and Order », he remarked that the world's criticism of the Church should rightly humble Christians

but that they « should not on that account accept the world's judgment on the matter ».

« The world », said the Archbishop of Canterbury, « does not hear the call to holiness, and does not care for truth in Christ » — both of which elements are integrally connected with the Biblical conception of unity. « But the world has its own care for unity, albeit conceived in a secular way. It desires that men and nations shall be joined to each other and the forces which separate them removed ».

« It is not just unity — togetherness with one another — that we seek ..., » he went on. « It is for unity in truth and holiness that we work and pray, for that is Christ's supernatural gift to us. Let that always be made clear ».

After noting that the quest for unity involves various aspects, such as the ascetical, the intellectual, the diplomatic, and practical approaches, Dr. Ramsey concluded:

« It includes the task within them all, of learning the truth in Christ in Scripture, in the Fathers, in the liturgies, in contemporary scolarship, in the self-criticism of systems and formulations, a task in which we have been finding ourselves, thank God, rather less like rivals and rather more like fellow-learners ».

Another significant address made to the delegates at New Delhi was that of Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, chairman of the Central Committee of the W. C. C. One of the principal points he made was a refutation of the criticism that the World Council was trying to build a super-Church. Declaring such a view to be a misconception, Dr. Fry said that actually the course of the World Council is determined bp the member churches themselves, each of which is listened to with respect.

Commenting further, the noted American Lutheran said: « ... The World Council has never experienced a really calm day since it came into existence, not a single twenty-four hours on which it could be phlegmatic or relaxed or introverted. God has simultaneously called it into life and to strenuous action. For the World Council of Churches, it is more than merely a matter of being swept along by the rushing stream of history; it has momentum in itself.

« The Christian community, acting together, needs to feel an obligation nowadays to be the pathfinder. It will never again be enough for us to assume what has sometimes been called our customary role in the past, that of simply being critics after the fact. We need to guide or at least contribute to guiding.

« The one thing surest », was Dr. Fry's conclusion, « is that the ecumenical movement no longer, if it ever was, is the affair

of a coterie of specialists. The policies of the World Council of Churches of today grow out of the collective wisdom; they represent the consensus of a swelling multitude of the trusted leaders of the churches all over the world ».

The necessity for extending the sessions of the Third Assembly over a period of almost three weeks could be seen from the variety of the topics discussed. Among them were Bible study, the role of the laity, racism, inter-church aid, assistance to refugees, social changes, nuclear weapons, and international affairs. On these subjects the delegates heard a number of well-thought out reports and comments, and enthusiasm was everywhere evident. It was this sense of dedication that called forth the praise of the Catholic observer from the United States, Fr. Edward Duff, S. J., director of the Institute for Social Order in St. Louis.

« These people really want to stay together », he remarked. « It is not just theoretical. The eagerness of their work and prayer is very inspiring ».

Before concluding its work, the Third Assembly issued its traditional message (cf. the documentary section of this issue of *Unitas*) and an *Appeal to All Governments and Peoples* in which the dominant note was the concern for peace. The next general assembly is expected to take place in another six or seven years either in Africa or in Australia. Thus far invitations have been extended to the World Council from Ethiopian and Australian church authorities, but the final decision will be made by the Central Committee some two years before the date is set for the Fourth Assembly. (*NC* and *EPS*).

* * *

Cardinal Bea Sees Coming Council Facilitating the Way to Unity

The coming ecumenical council will make no concessions in matters of doctrine for the sake of Christian unity, but its pronouncements should make efforts toward unity easier.

This was the view expressed in an address by Augustin Cardinal Bea S. J., president of the preparatory Secretariat for Christian Unity for the council. It was made to a large audience in the Hall of Congresses at Zurich late in November. Almost the entire Protestant theological faculty of Zurich University was present for the address.

While telling his hearers that doctrinal concessions should not be expected, Cardinal Bea said that he was convinced that the council would « throw light on the elements of the treasury of re-

vealed truths which are of primary importance for our separated brethren ».

One of the most important of these doctrines which interest non-Catholics, the Cardinal said, is that which concerns the nature of the Church. In this respect he declared: « The doctrine that proposes that the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ engenders a series of questions, and it is in these questions that many of the serious difficulties of non-Catholics are found. It will be a matter then of presenting these truths, in a proper light, capable of dispelling objections and the bases on which these objections are founded ».

« There are many other areas », continued Cardinal Bea, « in which the ecumenical council night be expected to take into consideration some of the hopes of our separated brothers. These concern mainly the questions of ecclesiastical rights, of worship, and of piety ».

The Cardinal then quoted a statement made earlier by Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, who said: « Once the truth is recognized that the Church cannot accept any compromise, those sons who may return to her will find a mother ready to perform all the generosities that are in her power in the areas of liturgy, tradition, and discipline ».

Referring to efforts toward Christian unity within the Catholic Church itself, Cardinal Bea noted that the first task is « to make all baptized people know that they have a serious duty as Christians to devote themselves to the cause of unity ».

When Church authorities insist on controlling efforts for unity, he added, « it is not so much a matter of abusive centralization of the various undertakings in different parts of the Church, but of coordinating them cautiously. Generally speaking, it can be said that the council will be in a position to give directives adapted to our times, and more specifically regarding the ecumenical movement among Catholics ».

It would be wrong to underestimate the difficulties that stand in the way of unity, declared the Cardinal, but it would be just as wrong to be frightened into inactivity because of these obstacles. He added: « Let us with confidence and courage, with love and prayer, with work and penance, follow the road that leads to the union of all who are baptized in Christ ».

In an interview with Swiss newspapermen, Cardinal Bea outlined the principal difficulties that the cause of unity encounters with the Orthodox, Anglicans, and Protestants. As to the Orthodox, Cardinal Bea said that « apart from historical misunderstandings and resentments, the main difficulty lies in the primacy of the Pope and more particularly in the infallibility of the Pope ».

For the Anglicans and Protestants, he continued, « one could say that the real difficulty on which everything ultimately depends is the question of the concept of the Church, of its power, and of its teaching authority ».

« Among the Lutherans and the followers of the Reformation », concluded Cardinal Bea, « there is also the difficulty created by the absence of a hierarchy which was refused on principle. That authority, which can define the duties of conscience for believers, constitutes also one of the more serious problems in the practical matter of meetings and exchanges of views. One always wonders with whom one should deal and who has the authority to put into practice the possible results of these meetings ». (*Kipa*).

* * *

A Secretariat for Christian Unity in France

By means of a notice published in the *Semaine Religieuse* in December, Cardinal Maurice Feltin, Archbishop of Paris, made it officially known that he had set up a diocesan secretariat for Christian unity.

In his announcement the Cardinal stresses the growing interest within his diocese « for the great cause of the restoration of the unity of Christians which Pope John seems to have made the preoccupation of his pontificate ». Accordingly, to encourage the participation of the clergy and of the faithful in this movement, he has decided to establish the diocesan secretariat for unity which will carry out its activities with the participation of the *Istina* center in Paris, the Unitas Association, and the *Unité chrétienne* society.

This activity will consist in arranging for reciprocal information and collaboration and will particularly concern itself with the Octave of Prayer for Unity from January 18 to 25. Father C. Dumont of *Istina* has been named moderator for the secretariat. (*Ansa*)

* * *

Topic of Christian Unity Discused over Australian Television

Christian unity was the subject recently of a television symposium over the Australian national network, with a British Jesuit, an Anglican prelate, and a Presbyterian professor each taking part.

Anglican Bishop John Vockler of Adelaide called present Christian disunity a « scandal and stumbling block » and said that unity would not be found simply around a conference table but through prayer, repetance, and humility. He also cited the words of the late Cardinal Mercier of Belgium that if Christians were to love each other, they must know each other; and if they were to know each other, they must meet each other.

Father Bernard Leeming, S. J., a British expert on ecumenical affairs and author of *The Churches and the Church* which appeared last year, described growing friendliness between the World Council of Churches and the Catholic Church. He also pointed to the cultivation of this feeling by agencies such as the Vatican's Secretariat for Christian unity. He affirmed that theologians now are looking for the truths in other faiths rather than the errors. He agreed with Bishop Vockler that hopes of unity rest with God rather than with the deeds of men.

Professor J. Davis McCaughey, of Ormond Presbyterian College at Melbourne said in his turn that three forces are causing a groundswell for unity: the prayers of all Christians, a new interest in basic Scripture texts, and Christian love. (*NC*)

* * *

Rabbi Tells of Jewish Hopes for the Second Vatican Council

Jews look upon the coming ecumenical council with « eager anticipation », according to a Jewish rabbi who writes in the *Ave Maria*, a national Catholic weekly magazine published at Notre Dame, Indiana.

The hopeful attitude, which is in direct contradiction to Jewish feelings toward previous councils, is expressed by an article entitled « A Jew Looks at the Ecumenical Council », appearing in the December 9th issue of the review. Jews once feared such councils, declares the author, but recent popes have established a profounder sense of brotherhood with Jews.

Among the steps that Jews hope to see taken by the Second Vatican Council, according to Rabbi Gilbert, is « a clear statement renouncing anti-Semitism, defining the role of Israel in God's eternal purpose, and acknowledging the Church's relationship to spiritual Semitism through the fatherhood of Abraham ».

« Jews in America », he went on, « hope also that there can be further conversation on such subjects as the relation of Church and State, the moral use of political power by church organizations

in shaping the public order, and the Church's responsibility in charity to other faith groups in a pluralistic society ».

A significant stumbling block to any direct Jewish participation in the council is the fact that there is no one representative body in existence which could be sure of the support of all Jewry, Rabbi Gilbert declares. Nevertheless, he points out, Augustin Cardinal Bea, who has been appointed by the Vatican to maintain communication with other churches, has expressed the hope that Jews will set up a committee to keep in contact with the Second Vatican Council. (*NC*)

BOOK REVIEWS

Begegnung der Christen. Studien evangelischer und katholischer Theologen. Hrsg. Maximilian Roesle und Oscar Cullmann. Evangelisches Verlaèwerk, Stuttgart und Verlag Josef Knecht - Carolusdruckerei, Frankfurt a. Main, 2. Aufl. 1960, in18°, 696 pp.

For the seventieth birthday of Otto Karrer it would have been difficult to select a more significant or worthy gift than this collection of ecumenical studies entitled: « Meeting of Christians ». The work itself in an eloquent testimony, not only of the great esteem which Karrer enjoys from both Catholics and Protestants, but also, in the words of H. Dombois, one of the Protestant collaborators, « that the demand for unity is heards and met with all seriousness ». (p. 391.) In fact, Karrer has been for Switzerland, and in part, for Germany, one of the principal, if not the principal Catholic promoter of a live, dynamic, concrete, and fraternal meeting between Catholic and Protestant theologians. His person and his works have assumed for many a meaning quasi symbolic of the determination to no longer ignore the existence of two separate groups; but rather, to meet, to know and to love each other as a means to achieve the common ideal of Christian unity. To this ideal Karrer has consacrated the greater part of his productive years, dominated always by the persuasion, as he himself writes in an autobiographical sketch (pp. 13-24) that all of us have many amends to make: « That which stirs me and moves me most profoundly, after many years of ecumenical experience, is the fact of having learned (I may really say that) that even we Catholics, as also the evangelists, Protestants on their part, have many things for which to make amends ». (p. 21.) Karrer recalls personal contacts with Protestant theologians and pastors as some of the finest signs from God during the course of his lifetime. (p. 21.)

The work is comprised of parallel studies, one Catholic and the other Protestant. The seventeen themes are well-selected because of their fundamentality regarding the differences which separate the Christian confessions. Even if the treatment of a theme often does not correspond exactly with that of the parallel study,

and neither of the two authors resolves exactly the problem of the other, this exposition in the form of a diptych, often achieves the vivacity and expression of an actual ecumenical dialogue, such as has yet to be found in a similar work. The only thing that remains to be desired is that the respective authors might be able to obtain a better notion of each other's corresponding essay before giving a definite form to their own articles. It is permissible to hope that with the development of studies and ecumenical comparisons we might ultimately reach this form of written dialogue with colloquies more fitting and apropos, and more adapt at grasping the true nucleus of the problem. However, even in its present form, the work is extraordinarily rich in content and in the ideas which it may provoke in the minds of perceptive readers, and notwithstanding inadequacy, inevitable in literary contributions so varied and diverse, it must be called not only successful, but also extremely important and highly useful.

It would be impossible to present, either exhaustively or in summarized form without some omissions, all the abundance of descriptive and informative material concerning the present state of interconfessional discussions, and even more so to weigh the full import of the questions discussed. The field of ideas and questions presented in this book is much too vast. All that can be done is to cite at least the greater part of those articles most valuable and significant for the current situation. Mention should be made of the complete bibliography which is given of all Karrer's works until 1959, which will certainly please the author's admirers.

The subject matter of the book covers vast ground; it touches on biblical and dogmatic theology, history and the liturgy, law and ecumenical methodology. To cite the principal branches: Jesus and the Church; the unity of the Church in the New Testament; Scripture and Tradition, Faith and the sacraments; spiritual ministry and the community of the faithful; justification and sanctification; St. Peter, the Rock; the ministry of Peter in the infant Church; the schism within the faith and the problems of unity; the Augustana Confession and the Council of Trent in an ecumenical profile; the place of the Patriarch and the bishop in the canon law of the Oriental Church; the present state of schism and the duty of unity; the present state of, and possible hopes for, theological studies; liturgical education; the Virgin Mary as a figure of grace and sanctity; the Reformation in the judgement of the Reformers; new strivings for unity: in sum, a whole panorama of touchy and urgent problems on the ecumenical horizon. But there is also a central thought, a dominant concern in all these diverse problems, which pervades and joins them all. From one article to

the other, — from the beginning to the end of the book the reader is led to ponder the same fundamental question: what and where is the true and basic difference between the Catholic and Protestant faiths; why did the tragic separation come about and why has it lasted through the centuries until the present day; how can it be overcome? The answers, naturally, vary according to the different points of view, but all of them seek to be a faithful and sincere manifestation of those things which individual groups of separated Christians hold most dear and most valuable within their own confessions and within their individual Christian lives.

Regarding the old question and its precise meaning widely discussed even now among Protestants: whether Jesus founded a Church completely distinct from the community of Israel, *E. Finke* shows that the life of Jesus itself not only places each man in a position confronting the fundamental personal decision, — but placing him « in Christ » leads him necessarily to the new, common life, in social and community form. It is in this context, according to this writer, that the known *logion* concerning the foundation of the Church on the Rock-Peter is to be placed (Mt. 16, 18). The community character of the Church makes evident this meaningful polarity: She is in Christ, from whom she derives origin, and she has, in her visible body, in her juridical and social order, in her life and ministry, — the Christ living hidden within « herself ». From the Catholic view, A. Vögtle examines the same problem, weighing scriptural texts with a severe and objective critical rigor. He emphasizes forcefully that the Church presupposes as finished the redemptive work of the cross and the resurrection, whence she receives life and interior strength, together with a dynamic eschatological orientation. The Church is clearly of a post-paschal formation, (« eine erst nachosterliche Grösze ») as he expresses it. (p. 58). Parting from the conclusions drawn by Kümmel, the author underlines the principle that the new people of God belong to the time of eschatological fullness (p. 63) that begins with the paschal mystery; thus, he writes, in Biblical perspective, the Kingdom of God is not always completely identified with the Church, — even in its present and terrestrial phase (p. 65).

For that which concerns the genuine concept of tradition, *R. Geiselmann* affirms energetically that « nothing, absolutely nothing was decided at the Council of Trent concerning the relation between Scripture and Tradition » (p. 141), given that in the final decree, the formula « partim-partim » of the preceding scheme was substituted with « et-et » (p. 141). The change came about more or less brusquely, from the 6th to the 8th of April 1546. Obviously, at this point not all is completely clear. The precise and express

intention for this change does not appear from the Acts of the Council, and thus, according to Geiselmann, « it remains completely in the dark » (p. 142). He is personally convinced that the post-tridentine theological explanation, characterized by the anti-reform position, caused by Melchior Cano and headed by Canisius (p. 134), separates too mechanically, as two fonts of Revelation, — Scripture and Tradition, — so as to become, in its most accentuated expression, « a mechanical and un-Catholic division » (p. 143), supposing that many doctrines essential for salvation are presented only in Tradition and not at all in Scripture. The Gospel of Christ, explains Geiselmann, is found wholly in Scripture, and wholly in Tradition (p. 144), in such a way that every traditional doctrine and especially those defined by the Church always finds at least a support in Sacred Scripture (p. 156).

In any event, the discussion is not yet closed: in our view, the integration of the conciliar decree will have to be taken up and examined anew as to whether the change of the earlier form of the scheme comports, according to the intention of the Fathers of the Council of Trent, a change also in the doctrine and in the concept of Tradition. Unfortunately, the positive data as drawn from the Acts are meager and little evident. Because of this Geiselmann's explanation has found, alongside of fervent supporters, serious and tenacious opposition. Furthermore, it is absolutely necessary to determine whether a simple reference or counterpart of any doctrine, clearly from Tradition with a scriptural reference is sufficient to maintain, in so far as content goes, that all of revelation is found as much in Tradition as it is in Scripture. However, to Geiselmann goes the credit for having sought intelligently the exact sense of the Tridentine definition so as to remove notions and stumbling-blocks which are certainly useless, and even perhaps non-existent in the theological elaboration of the concept of Tradition. He attempts a meeting with the Protestant view in so far as he deems it just and possible, just as, from the opposite side, *E. Kinder* moves decisively toward an acknowledgement of a worthy tradition, without, however, repressing the essential difference that remains in the fact that for Protestants, Tradition never holds the normative value which it has above all in Catholicism. (p. 131).

Tradition is taken very seriously, Kinder writes, but nowhere is it taken as an absolute value in relation to the salvific action of God in Christ; to Scripture remains the merit of being the ultimate column of the Church. (p. 131).

H. Asmussen selects a burning theme; that of transubstantiation and of the sacrificial character of the Last Supper. Further-

more, almost to render it even more difficult, he takes as his point of departure the unfortunately famous work of Luther *De captivitate babylonica* of 1521. Comparing it to the Lutheran doctrine of today, Asmussen observes that Luther's theses have not been integrally accepted by the Lutheran Church. (But Luther himself subsequently changed some of his opinions previously expressed in this polemical book). Until today, the Lutheran Church has not given a clear and concise role regarding its actual doctrine of transubstantiation. From Catholic theology and the Church however, Asmussen seeks enlightenment as to the precise meaning of the Eucaristic doctrine, both from Scholastic concepts and from the Thomist phraseology translated into the contemporary language of modern philosophy. Even as regards the second question, that of sacrifice, the current position does not fully coincide with that of Luther. The plain and simple question lies in determining in what way and sense, and up to what point that « the work of God » can be at the same time « the work of man » and vice-versa (p. 178). The identical problem arises on the vast liturgical scheme for prayer and preaching and more so for the sacraments in general. These are questions which may be solved only if placed within the circle of the Church which unites the individual with the community (ibid.). *E. Walter,* instead, treats the theme of the faith and the sacraments from the pastoral point of view. Pastoral work naturally includes both these elements, — faith and sacraments or mysteries: the Eucharist is truly a « mystery of faith » (191-192). The community and the pastoral ministry, explains Walter, stand not only alongside each other, but also facing each other and even against each other (« zugleich Miteinander und Gegenüber »), one conditions the other, referring themselves together to Christ Himself. In fact, it is Christ Himself that acts on the community in the mysteries, while, on the other hand, the action of the community unites itself through the representation and through the task given the ministry (p. 209). The author refutes any sacramental concession given to the ministry, viewing therein a danger to the rights of the laity. (p. 210).

With ample and accurate research, *J. Ringger* examines the noted classic text on the primacy of Peter in the light of the long Hebrew-Aramaic tradition of the « holy Rock » basing his argument on previous research by J. Jeremias, and expanding it with new texts, drawn from the Qumrân writings (p. 285). Thus he arrives at his conclusion: « The Rock-Peter stands fast and firm because it holds the Holy Tower which leads to Paradise and because it opposes the power of the abyss and of the devil » (p. 285). Such was the sense and the symbolic significance to which the figure of

the Rock-Peter could have given rise in the mind of the hearers of Christ and the Apostles, according to the Semitic substrata of the term. Consequently « nothing more precludes the way to a primal position of Peter within the group of the twelve » (p. 290). We should note, however, that according to this author, Peter is within the group and not above it (p. 291). Mathew's gospel has preserved the primitive and original context of this statement, says the author (p. 306). The Apostle Peter is not, therefore, merely the first rock of construction along with the others and beside them; Peter is « the permanent base which holds the entire structure », and therefore must be transmitted through the succeeding centuries. The manner in which he is so, adds Rinnger, is however, not clearly expressed in the Gospel (p. 309) (« Nicht ein Stein unter anderen ist, sondern *bleibend* tragender Grund füd den Bau der Kirche », p. 309-310).

J. Schmid, from the Catholic viewpoint, answers the objections to the genuinity of the primatial text, drawn principally from an incomplete interpretation of the figure and of the position of Peter within the infant Church according to the Acts of the Apostles. The term Peter, or rather « Petros » (in Greek), he notes, was from the beginning a descriptive qualifier and not the proper name that it later became, and was translated from Aramaic into Greek probably before the transition came about. Later, taken as a proper name, it eliminated and substituted the Aramaic name « Simon » as is seen in Paul. The primitive Church gave to this new name of the Apostle Simon-Peter and to its meaning an importance of the first rank, — and this not because of the individual character of the Apostle which shows itself more or less wavering, but rather because of his precise spiritual function, promised and given him by Jesus Himself; in other words historically. (p. 358-359).

For *E. Stauffer,* the primacy of Peter is attested to in a manner more than evident, in the Acts. It can have its origin in no other source than a precise vocation from Jesus. What is more, its use evoked Jewish customs and traditions from the Old Testament and from Palestinian Judaism (p. 364). Stauffer energetically expresses his personal opinions which are not shared by all Protestants: the Apostle Paul's visit to Peter in Jerusalem was, says Stauffer, « a faux pas » (p. 366); James always aspired to the dominant position in the Church of Jerusalem and in fact, held it autochratically in the years from 44 to 62 A. D. (p. 371).

From the Catholic side *R. Hofstetter* collects the many indications, that, put together, demonstrate very clearly the route of the primacy of Peter from Jerusalem to Rome (pp. 387-389).

In a not too extended but remarkable study, *H. Jedin,* doing

an historical analysis from the decrees of the Council of Trent, places in relief the fact that the conciliar definitions did not intend to give a complete and exhaustive presentation of the truths of the faith, wherein every side and every aspect would have been placed proportionately in its own light but rather, intended to preclude the way to the false opinions from Protestantism that threatened to penetrate the Catholic Faith. To expect more, — to expect a theologically complete reply for the problems in question, would be to ask for precisely that which the Council did not intend to give (p. 459). « With its canons, the Council outlined the confines, within which and beside which a huge field remains open » (p. 461). Upon this field moves the ulterior theological work which must continue even in our time (p. 461).

For such a study *H. Fries* deems as a requisite a theological plenitude and totality colored by the plenitude of revelation, of which the dogmas expressly defined are only a part, — even if the principal part. He further recommends a well proportioned treatment which should make appear more clearly the vital center (« die Mitte ») of revealed doctrine, whence every part derives consistency, meaning and vitality; namely, — God in Christ who is our salvation (p. 358-359).

He openly declares himself favorable to a conscious insertion of theological studies in the universities in academic style, rather than in the separate higher ecclesiastical schools. (p. 545).

Regarding the liturgy, a notable accord appears from the two respective studies. *W. Stählin* underlines the rich interior possibilities of the liturgy consciously lived, and of its « formative and sustaining force » (p. 554), that frees man from the narrowness of individualism and transports him as a joyously active member of community life (p. 558). *H. Kahlefeld,* revindicating the value of genuine symbolism, even for modern man, conceives the liturgical life in its dual movement: as a work of God on His chosen people, and as a work of that people that receives and celebrates its very Lord in its own midst. (p. 572). He also warns that with all the progress achieved along this line, we find ourselves still at the beginning of a true liturgical formation of the community of the faithful, and that much ground still remains to be covered (p. 572).

Mariology still remains a timely and much discussed ecumenical theme, *V. Mayer,* admits that the Reformation, in contrast to the first Reformers, has kept an almost complete silence regard Mary, almost as though, says he, the gospel could remain the same even if no mention was made of Mary. However, even he remains firmly on Protestant ground, keeping his distance from Catholic Marian thought with the motivation that « Mary wishes to place

Christ in evidence, and thus she herself should not be place in evidence » (p. 592). And again: « The priestly ministry of Christ the High Priest needs no completion by means of another maternity » (p. 588). Opportunely, from the other side, A. Müller states in very precise terms the absolute need for Mariology to be placed organically and wisely in the general framework of the Redemption wrought by Christ (p. 594). He maintains that the preoccupation of the separated brethren with the « Marian phenomenon » in Catholicism today stems only from a resentment, from an a priori, negative orientation against the Virgin Mary. The true horizon of Catholic Mariology, Müller makes clear, rests always on the fact that Mary is a member of Christ and that even she receives her salvation from Christ (p. 600). It is perfectly true, as Müller states, that the genuine root of the question which divides Protestants from Catholics is this: *Is there, and what is the cooperation of a human being with his Creator?* And it is at this point that the maternity of the Virgin Mary shows us the right way: the Maternity demonstrates exactly an activity based on a gift received previously from which it originated (Aus-Empfangen-tätig-Sein — an expression that is practically untranslatable which could signify activity as much in « the receiving » as in « the conceiving » (p. 600).

The evolution within Protestantism in the 19th and 20th centuries as sketched by K. Kindt, from Luther's prologue to the *Opera Latina* (1545) and from two writings of Melanchthon (1546 and 1548) has a negative tone: we have become, he says, the very antipodes of reforming fathers (p. 615). With liberalism, Protestantism has lost its continuity and identity, going further from its own past by a distance greater than that which, in the preceeding epoch, separated Catholicism from the original Reformation (p. 615). The result is a situation filled with burning irony (p. 616). However, the germs of these opposing and paradoxical tendencies were already present at the beginning (pp. 616-617).

To conclude, R. Mumm and Father Sartory make a point of the multiple tendencies which today move toward that unity desired by all, and note the principal initiatives in both camps.

Much remains in this birthday gift which merits particular mention. However, what we have already said clearly shows the merit and the value of this work.

John Vodopivec

J. P. Michael, *Cristiani alla ricerca dell'unità*. Forward by Augustin Cardinal Bea. Brescia, Morcelliana, 1961.

This book, which appeared originally in German, is one of the most complete and informative works that one could read on the ecumenical movement. It is particularly valuable for that which regards the religious situation in Germany. The present Italian edition, furthermore, is enriched with useful additions. Its translators have conscientiously and with competence achieved a task beset with difficulties, and the production by the Morcelliana Press is worthy of praise.

It would not be inexact to trace the beginning of the ecumenical movement of today to the Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910. One cannot, in any case, overlook the preceding efforts of Pope Leo XIII, of Lord Halifax, and of Father Portal. Dr. Michael indicates an origin which was even earlier and more similar, for it was Protestant: the formula adopted at Paris in 1855 for the constitution of the Y.M.C.A. was already ecumenical.

The author then proceeds to give an account of the evolution of ecumenism, of the common struggle of German Christians against Nazism, of the development of thought after the Hitlerian tempest was over. He studies next, with a great deal of penetration, the different conceptions of the Church and of unity which are to be met with in the ecumenical sphere. Since for the Protestant the Church is neither infallible nor clearly defined, it follows that the variety of doctrines is difficult to avoid. The preciseness of doctrine and its binding character in the Catholic Church is repugnant to the individualism of the great number of Evangelicals. When the preparatory work for the conference on Faith and Order at Lund, Sweden, in 1952 marked a step ahead towards the constitution of a more positive doctrine, the contrary reaction swept it away. The description which Dr. Michael gives of Evangelic l thought reveals a profound doctrinal divergence with respect Catholic teaching. All the positions taken by Luther are ma - tained by it. Nevertheless, it is known that a good number of Protestant theologians are close to the Catholic point of view regarding justification, tradition, the Eucharist. Dr. Michael understands very well the situation of our separated brethren of the West after four centuries of division: they are employing in good faith those gifts of Christ which they conserved upon leaving e Mother Church. He is no less frank in maintaining the whole of Catholic truth on those points which are more contested: papal supremacy, Marian devotion, etc. Since he is himself a convert to the Catholic faith, he cannot despair of Christian unity. He gives

due credit to the World Council of Churches, but concludes: « The Roman Catholic Church can accompany with its prayers the aspirations of separated Christians towards reunification, but it cannot think of becoming a member of the World Council unless the latter were to be recognized as the one Church founded by Christ, that is the true Church ». (p. 232).

I should say willingly of this book that which we may read in the forward by His Eminence, Cardinal Bea: « Read together with unshaken fidelity to the truth and with profound charity towards our separated brethren, it will make us more deeply grounded in the truth of our faith, will cause our charity to grow, and will stimulate us in the practice of it ».

Charles Boyer, S. J.

INDEX FOR VOLUME XIII

ARTICLES

BELLUCCI, S. J., DINO,
The World Council of Churches on the Eve of the Third Assembly . . . . . III, 156

BOYER, S. J., CHARLES,
The Movement within Anglicanism towards Rome . . . I, 3
Current Trends in Catholic Ecumenism . . . . . II, 81
The Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches . III, 153
The Assembly of New Delhi in Retrospect . . . . IV, 235
Taizé, a Center of Ecumenism . . . . . IV, 239

GILL, S. J., JOSEPH,
Personalities of the Council of Florence:
VII. The Emperor, John VIII Palaeologus . . . . II, 101

HANAHOE, S. A., EDWARD,
The Theological Foundation of the Unity Octave . . III, 178

OESTERREICHER, MSGR. JOHN M.,
« I am Joseph, Your Brother » . . . . . I, 26

ORTIZ DE URBINA, S. J., I.,
Catholic Ecumenism . . . . . IV, 254

MATZERATH, S. A., ROGER,
Report from New Delhi . . . . . IV, 247

SCHULTZE, S. J., BERNARD,
The Question of « Communicatio in Sacris » . . . . I, 34

STIERNON, A. A., DANIEL,
Pope John XXIII and the Christian East, Part I . . I, 14
» » » » » » » Part II . . II, 92
» » » » » » » Part III . . III, 190

COMMENT AND DOCUMENTS

A Recent Monograph on the Church (Card. J. B. Montini . . I, 44
An Appeal for Charity and Prayer towards Christian Reunion (Card. A. Lienart) . . . . . I, 50

The Unity Conference of the Friars of the Atonement (S. Butler, S. A.) . . . . . II, 115
A Debate on Christian Unity in the House of Lords (C. Boyer, S. J.) . . . . . II, 122
An English Archbishop Discusses Some Recent Developments in the Field of Christian Unity . . . . . III, 201
The Reintegration of Christendom — Reflections of a Romanian Orthodox Metropolitan . . . . . III, 208
The Message of the Pan-Orthodox Conference of Rhodes . . III, 213
The Text of Pope John XXIII's Encyclical in Commemoration of St. Leo the Great, Dealing With the Unity of the Church IV, 265
A Catholic Appreciation of the Pan-Orthodox Conference at Rhodes . . . . . IV, 280
The Message of the Third Assembly of the World Council of Churches . . . . . IV, 294

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Cardinal Bea Says Council Will Mark Starting Point for Christian Reunion . . . . . I, 53
Importance of Secretariat for Unity Stressed by Preparatory Commission for Council . . . . . I, 55
Catholic Ecumenist Sees Better Understanding of Church Resulting from Council . . . . . I, 55
Executive Committee of World Council Meets in Geneva . . I, 56
Protestant Leader Asserts Church Unity is Urgent . . . . I, 57
Catholic and Protestant Experts Point to Ecumenical Role of Biblical Studies . . . . . I, 58
Prominent American Ecumenist Believes Realization of Unity Still far away . . . . . I, 59
Prayer more than Dialogue Advocated by Unity Octave Speaker . . . . . I, 60
American Students at Fribourg University Sponsor Unity Meeting . . . . . I, 60
Protestant Prior Says Very Announcement of Council Furthers Unity . . . . . I, 61
Lutheran Group Advocating Reunion with Catholic Church Holds First Convention . . . . . I, 62
Anglican Churchman Appointed for Liaison with Vatican Secretariat for Unity . . . . . I, 64
Improved Catholic-Protestant Relations Cited in Columbia . I, 64
Delegation from the Pope Visits Ecumenical Patriarch at Istanbul . . . . . II, 126
Suggestion on Ecumenical Council Being Received in Rome from Orthodox and Protestants . . . . . II, 127
Coming Council Viewed as Paving the Way for a Council Uniting Christianity . . . . . II, 128

Russian Orthodox Church Applies for Membership in the World Council of Churches . . . . . II, 129
Pan-Orthodox Conference planned for September . . . II, 130
Former Anglican Primate Refers to Vatican Secretariat as « An Exciting Advance » . . . . . II, 130
Cardinal Bea Meets with Anglican Liaison Officer in Rome . II, 131
New Anglican Primate Will Continue Efforts for Christian Unity . . . . . II, 132
Important Unity Conference Takes Place at Graymoor . . II, 132
Lutheran Theologian Sees Crisis in Ecumenical Movement . II, 133
Commission on Faith and Order Has New Director . . . II, 135
Editor Notes Hopeful Signs on Way to Church Unity . . II, 135
Protestant Insight into Divine Revelation Called Aid to Catholics . . . . . II, 136
Australian Catholic and Protestant Leaders Join in Prayer Appeal . . . . . II, 137
Annual Seminary Publication Dedicates Number to Eastern Churches . . . . . II, 137
Presbyterians Seek Merger of Four Major Protestant Churches II, 138
Pope John XXIII Indicates Way to Christian Unity . . . III, 216
Vatican to Send Official Observers to World Council of Churches' Assembly . . . . . III, 217
Pan-Orthodox Meeting Takes Place in Rhodes . . . . . III, 219
Ecumenical Patriarch Advocates Closer Ties Between Catholics and Orthodox . . . . . III, 221
Church to Make Possible Changes in Unity Cause, Cardinal Bea Declares . . . . . III, 222
Catholic, Protestant Leaders Approve Common Prayer Form for Meeting in Australia . . . . . III, 223
Catholic Committee to Promote Christian Unity Established in England . . . . . III, 224
American Anglo-Catholics Issue Manifesto on Christian Unity III, 225
Protestant Clergymen Attend Catholic Retreat . . . . III, 226
Fourth Faith and Order Conference Planned by World Council III, 227
Catholic and Protestant Scholars Discuss Scriptures at Oxford III, 227
Pope John XXIII Proclaims Ecumenical Council for 1962 . IV, 296
The World Council of Churches Holds Third Assembly at New Delhi . . . . . IV, 297
Cardinal Bea Sees Coming Colncil Facilitating the Way to Unity IV, 303
A Secretariat for Christian Unity in France . . . . . IV, 305
Topic of Christian Unity Discussed over Australian Television IV, 305
Rabbi Tells of Jewish Hopes for the Second Vatican Council IV, 306

AROUND THE WORLD

AUSTRALIA
Catholic Archbishop and Protestant Leaders Warn Youth of Wrong Influences . . . . . I, 74
Revolution in Catholic Attitudes Seen by Journalist . II, 145

CANADA
Anglican Bishops Laud Classes in Religion in Ontario Schools . . . . . II, 145

ENGLAND
Nem Testament Appears in Modern Translation . . . I, 69
English Queen to Visit Pope John in May . . . . I, 69
Prime Minister Sees World Struggle Ending when Communists Pose Questions of Man and God . . . . II, 143

FRANCE
Cardinal Tisserant Named to the French Academy . . II. 140

GERMANY
East Germany Regime Seeks Catholic Loyalty Pledge . I, 71

HOLLAND
Dutch Bishops Issue Publication on Second Vatican Council . . . . . I, 70
Seven Cathedrals Linked in Pentecost Broadcast . II, 143

HUNGARY
Vatican Newspaper Denies Reports of Better Church-State Relations . . . . . I, 73

ITALY
3000 University Students Take Part in March of Faith . II, 144

PALESTINE
An Inscription Bearing Name of Pilate Discovered at Caesarea . . . . . II, 147

POLAND
Catholic Primate Appeals for Loyalty of Clergy in New Wave of Persecution . . . . . I, 72

ROME
Cardinal Secretary of State Emphasizes Aims of Vatican Diplomacy . . . . . I, 66
Beginning of Ecumenical Council Seen for Autumn of 1962 . . . . . II, 139
Catholic and non-Catholic Scholars Complete Volume for Vatican Library . . . . . II, 140

SOUTH AFRICA
South Africa Archbishop Calls on Religious Leaders to Oppose Nation's Racial Segregation . . . . . II, 146

SPAIN
Government Meets Bishops' Opposition on Press Restrictions . . . . . I, 71

SWEDEN
Lutheran Bishops Petition King on Marriage Laws . . I, 72

UNITED STATES
Scholar Cites Importance of Dead Sea Scrolls for Authenticity of Scriptures . . . . . I, 67
United States Government Called upon to Recognize Eastern Orthodox as Major Religious Body . . . . I, 68
Noted Catholic Historian Discusses Restoration of Christian Elements in Education . . . . . II, 141
Protestant Church Council Urges « Appreciation of Religion » in Schools . . . . . II, 142

BOOK REVIEWS

Begegnung der Christen. Studien evangelischer und katholischer Theologen. Hrsg. Maximilian Roesle und Oscar Cullmann (J. Vodopivec) . . . . . IV, 308

CLARK, S. J., FRANCIS
Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation (J. Gill, S. J.) II, 148

DAMBORIENA, S. J., PRUDENCIO
Fe Catolica e Iglesias y Secta de la Reforma (C. Boyer, S. J.) . . . . . III, 228

HARDON, S. J., JOHN A.
Christianity in Conflict — A Catholic View of Protestantism (P. Damboriena, S. J.) . . . . . III, 231

LEEMING, S. J., BERNARD
The Churches and the Church (G. Tomaino, S. A.) . . . I, 75

MICHAEL, J. P.
Cristiani alla ricerca dell'unità (C. Boyer, S. J.) . . . IV, 316

SCHÜTTE, H.
Um die Wiedervereinigung im Glauben (J. Vodopivec) . I, 77

VILLAIN, MAURICE
La Prière de Jesus pour l'unité chrétienne (C. Boyer, S. J.) II, 152

WATKIN, E. I.
The Church in Council (J. Gill, S. J.) . . . . . II, 150

NONCIRCULATING